



2026:DHC:338



\$~3

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 15.01.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4871/2025**

VINEET

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sakshi and Ms. Ritika,
Advocates.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with SHO/Inspector M.P. Singh.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 1044/2022 of PS Mangolpuri for offence under Section 302/307/147/148/149/120B IPC and 25/27 Arms Act.
2. In furtherance of last order, SHO/Inspector M.P. Singh has appeared along with the investigation file. IO has not appeared and is stated to be on his way. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State.
3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant



according to the FIR is that the co-accused Shahrukh caught hold of the deceased Armaan, after which the present accused/applicant and co-accused Sameer and Saif inflicted multiple knife blows, killing Armaan.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the entire incident of stabbing is captured in video footage, which does not depict the accused/applicant. The said video footage is shown to me as well as to learned APP assisted by the SHO and admittedly the accused/applicant is not depicted in the same. However, learned APP submits that there is a screenshot depicting the accused/applicant carrying a knife. But from that, in the absence of any further material, nothing can be inferred.

5. Learned APP opposes the bail application on the ground of seriousness of the incident and the manner in which the offence was committed. Further, it is contended that one of the weapon of offence also was recovered at the instance of the accused/applicant. Learned APP submits the status report, which is accepted across the board, to be scanned and made part of the record.

6. Further, it is submitted by learned counsel for accused/applicant that for past three years, not a single witness of prosecution has come forward to testify and the accused/applicant cannot be kept in jail endlessly. There are total 27 prosecution witnesses.

7. Learned counsel for accused/applicant also submits that co-accused



Sameer, who according to the prosecution had exactly same role as that of the present accused/applicant, has already been granted bail by the learned trial court by way of order dated 09.01.2026. This is not disputed by prosecution.

8. In a nutshell, the video footage of the stabbing incident admittedly does not depict the accused/applicant; despite passage of three years, no prosecution witness has been examined and the total number of prosecution witnesses being 27, trial is not likely to conclude soon; and most importantly, in view of bail already granted to co-accused Sameer, the present accused/applicant cannot be denied parity as role alleged against both of them is same.

9. Considering the above circumstances, 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.25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

10. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

JANUARY 15, 2026/ry