



\$~62

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 12.02.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 623/2026, CRL.M.A. 4788/2026 & CRL.M.A. 4789/2026**

MOHD KHALID

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dalip Kumar Santoshi, Mr. Mohan Paliwal, Mr. Munish Kumar and Mr. Saurabh Kumar, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State with SI Aayush Rajput, PS Jama Masjid.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

1. The applicant/accused seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 51/2017 of Police Station Jama Masjid for the offence under Section 135 Electricity Act, 2003.
2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP assisted by Investigating Officer/SI Aayush Rajput.
3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant is that



he was involved in theft of electricity and did not appear before the trial court till he was declared a Proclaimed Offender. The accused/applicant was arrested on 05.01.2026. Further, as reflected from record, the accused/applicant was earlier convicted for similar offence of electricity theft and 195 inspections were carried out at different premises belonging to the accused/applicant and his family, where theft of electricity was detected.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that it is a simple case of theft in which he is in custody since 05.01.2026. Learned counsel for accused/applicant also submits that he is ready to pay the entire outstanding bill of Rs. 96,000/- approximately pertaining to this case.

5. Learned APP strongly opposes the bail application contending that the accused/applicant is a Bad Character of the area and involved in as many as 21 FIRs, many of which pertain to electricity theft. It is also contended that despite conviction for electricity theft in the case FIR No. 21/2013 of PS Jama Masjid, the accused/applicant continues to repeat the offence. In addition, learned APP submits that the accused/applicant is also involved in certain FIRs pertaining to extortion, robbery, besides Arms Act.

6. In response, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the alleged involvement in robbery is not relevant for deciding the present bail application, which pertains to electricity theft.

7. Considering the overall circumstances, including the antecedents,



2026:DHC:1206



especially conviction for the same offence for which the accused/applicant has been booked in the present case, I do not find it fit to grant bail to the accused/applicant.

8. Therefore, the bail application and the accompanying applications are dismissed.

9. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for being conveyed to the accused/applicant immediately.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

FEBRUARY 12, 2026/dr