



2026:DHC:1104



\$~9

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

*Date of Decision: 10.02.2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2886/2025**

ANAND MANDAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sunil Tiwari, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for  
State.

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 81/2014 of PS Mandawali for offence under Section 395/394/411/34 IPC.

2. At the outset, once again in this case also neither the investigating officer nor the SHO Mandawali has bothered to appear and assist learned prosecutor. Consequently, learned prosecutor expresses inability to disclose the status of trial of this case. Even counsel for accused/applicant has not appeared. Adjourning the matter in such situation would not be appropriate in view of old pendency of this bail application. This application is amongst



179 old pending bail applications received by this bench by way of transfer from different benches and today is the first date before this bench.

3. Broadly speaking, the prosecution case registered on the first information of the complainant Vishwajeet Singh is as follows. The complainant is running a mobile phone shop and on 29.01.2014 at about 04:15am when he was sleeping in his home on the first floor above his shop, suddenly he heard the sound of opening of shutter. When he peeped down, he saw some boys standing outside his shop, speaking with someone inside the shop. When he raised alarm, the boys standing outside the shop fled away after which he and his brother Mahender jumped down and with the help of neighbours apprehended three boys inside his shop. Those three boys were carrying a rod used to uproot the shutter. Those boys tried to flee but were apprehended after exchange of some fisticuffs. In the meanwhile, two police officials passing by came and apprehended those boys. Those apprehended boys were Gulam Mukhtar, Hader Ali and Sabir. Those boys who fled away included the present accused/applicant.

4. At this stage, learned counsel for accused/applicant has appeared.

5. In response to a specific query, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that till date no evidence has been adduced by prosecution before the trial court.

6. It is also disclosed by learned counsel for accused/applicant that the



accused/applicant is in custody since 08.04.2025. On this, learned APP submits that the accused/applicant was earlier declared Proclaimed Offender, which in itself is a ground to deny him bail. But learned counsel for accused/applicant explains that the accused/applicant, while on bail in this case got arrested in another case, so the trial court issued production warrants and it is then that he appeared. It is also submitted by learned counsel for accused/applicant that he is already on bail in the other cases.

7. Considering the overall circumstances mentioned above, I find no reason to further deprive liberty to the accused/applicant. The application is allowed, and it is directed that the accused/applicant be released on bail, subject to his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial court.
8. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.
9. In view of circumstances mentioned in paragraph 2 hereof, copy of this order be also sent to the concerned DCP for necessary action.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**FEBRUARY 10, 2026/ry**