



2026:DHC:1991



\$~72

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

%

*Date of Decision: 10.03.2026*

+

**BAIL APPLN. 918/2026, CRL.M.A. 6958/2026 & CRL.M.A. 6959/2026 & CRL.M.A. 6960/2026**

RAMESH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhakar Tiwari, Mr. Ajay Kr. Srivastav and Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocates

versus

STATE OF GNCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the State with SI Rajak Ahmad

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

### **J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 357/2024 of Police Station Chitranjan Park for offence under Section 309(6)/310(2)/311/317(3)/61(2)/3(5) BNS and Section 25/27 of the Arms Act.
2. Learned APP for the State accepts notice.
3. On behalf of accused/applicant, it is contended that all remaining co-accused persons have already been granted bail by this Court on different dates after detailed discussion comparing the contents of the belated FIR in



the light of the different CCTV footages produced. On ground of parity, the accused/applicant claims bail.

4. Learned APP submits that this is not a case of parity because the snatched anklet was recovered from the present accused/applicant. It is contended that co-accused Waris had snatched the anklet and handed it over to the present accused/applicant.

5. I have examined the different orders by which co-accused persons were granted bail. Detailed circumstances have been described in those bail orders, copies whereof have already been annexed with the present bail application. As described in detail in those bail orders, the truthfulness of contents of the FIR in the light of the CCTV footage is suspect; there is unexplained delay of two days in lodging the complaint; and one wonders as to why so many armed persons would enter house of a jeweller and flee after snatching out only an anklet from foot of wife of the complainant *de facto*.

6. As regards the issue of recovery of the anklet from the present accused/applicant, as recorded in the other bail orders, the persons depicted in the alleged CCTV footage were with muffled faces and it is not possible to ascertain as to who snatched the anklet. Even as regards the alleged snatching of the anklet, in the initially produced CCTV footage, there was no depiction of such snatching and it is only in the last shown CCTV footage that some scuffle between some muffled persons with apparently a lady was visible. Of course, all these aspects have to be examined by the trial court independent of the views taken in these orders.



2026:DHC:1991



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 Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.

9. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**MARCH 10, 2026**  
**'rs'**