



2026:DHC:1989



§~8

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Date of Decision: 10.03.2026+ **BAIL APPLN. 715/2026, CRL.M.A. 5551/2026 & CRL.M.A. 5550/2026**

SHEHZAD @KARO

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manohar Naagar and Mr. Akhil
Gusain, Advocates

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State with SI Abhay Bhati**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No.580/2023 of Police Station Madhu Vihar for offence under Section 392/394/397/34 IPC.
2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for the State assisted by IO/SI Abhay Bhati.
3. Broadly speaking, the prosecution case is that the complainant *de facto* met the present accused/applicant, who pretended as if he had been hit by a TSR in front of Max Hospital. When the complainant *de facto* got down from his car to help the accused/applicant, two boys standing nearby came on a motorcycle and after snatching the gold chain worn by the



complainant *de facto*, fled away. It is alleged that the accused/applicant also brandished a knife.

4. It is contended by learned counsel for accused/applicant that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated. It is also contended that the accused/applicant was not named in the FIR. Further, it is submitted by learned counsel that complainant *de facto* has already been examined during trial, so there is no scope of the accused/applicant trying to influence anyone.

5. Learned APP opposes the bail application on the ground that the seriousness of offence cannot be ignored.

6. In response to a specific query, it is stated by the IO that according to the admitted position, the accused/applicant was not known to the complainant *de facto* and the former was not arrested from the spot, but no test identification proceedings were carried out. The accused/applicant is in custody since 09.11.2023 and no public witness remains to be examined, as per IO.

7. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find any reason to deprive further liberty to the accused/applicant. Therefore, the bail application is allowed and accused/applicant is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

8. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail



2026:DHC:1989



Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.

9. Of course, nothing observed in this order shall be read to the prejudice of either side at the final stage of the trial.

10. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

MARCH 10, 2026

'rs'