



2026:DHC:2018



\$~6

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

%

*Date of Decision: 11.03.2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 490/2025**

ROHIT@MOHIT@SNIPER (IN JC)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shyam Manohar, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) THROUGH SHO .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State  
with SI Deepak Kumar.

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

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

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No.03/2024 of PS Jahangir Puri for offence under Section 307/120B/147/148/149/34 IPC and 25 Arms Act.
2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Deepak.
3. Broadly speaking, the prosecution case is that the injured/complainant *de facto* was fired at by the co-accused Suraj @ Rishab, but the complainant *de facto* saved himself and fled, and the misfired shot hit a child. While



2026:DHC:2018



fleeing, the complainant *de facto* was followed by the remaining accused persons, one of whom was the present accused/applicant, carrying knife in his hand.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that he has been falsely implicated in this case. It is also contended that co-accused Suraj @ Rishab, who allegedly fired at the complainant *de facto* has already been released on bail because the complainant *de facto* and the child who was injured in the incident did not identify him.

5. Learned APP for State fairly admits that both the complainant *de facto* as well as the injured child did not support prosecution case.

6. It is also strange to note that in the initial statement, which led to registration of the FIR, the complainant *de facto* specifically named the assailants, but did not name the present accused/applicant. It is only subsequently in supplementary statement that he added names of the present accused/applicant, one Sahil, one Meet @ Golu also as assailants and further added that they were accompanied with 2-3 more persons, who were carrying knife in their hands.

7. Considering the above circumstances, I find no reason to further deprive 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



2026:DHC:2018



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.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**MARCH 11, 2026/ry**