



2026:DHC:2297



\$~6&7

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

% *Date of Decision: 19.03.2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 545/2026**

NAVEEN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. B.P. Sharma, Mr. Tej Varun, Mr. Amjad Khan, Mr. Sumit Kumar and Mr. Mohd. Azruddin, Advocates

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State with SI/Inspector Virender

+ **BAIL APPLN. 997/2026**

SANJEEV SAGAR @ SANDEEP @ ANKUL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Jain, Advocate

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State with SI/Inspector Virender

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicants seek regular bail in case FIR No. 435/2022 of PS Wazirabad for offence under Section 392/397/411/302/201/34 IPC.



2026:DHC:2297



2. Status report has not been filed, which shows that State is not seriously interested in opposing these bail applications.

3. Broadly speaking, prosecution case is as follows. On 27.05.2022, dead body of an unknown person was recovered near Burari flyover and on the basis of identity card, the body was found to be of one Rakesh. On being contacted, son of Rakesh informed the police that Rakesh had come to Delhi from their village in Sambhal, UP to distribute invitation cards for marriage of his son and for purchases. Son of the deceased also told that the deceased was carrying Rs.50,000/- cash for purchases and that at the railway station, the accused/applicant Naveen also purchased a travel ticket to Delhi. Further, son of the deceased told that on 26.05.2022, he received a phone call from the deceased, who was sounding disturbed and thereafter on 27.05.2022, the information about accident of the deceased was received through local *Pradhan*. According to prosecution, the accused/applicant Naveen killed the deceased by way of multiple knife blows and the accused/applicant Sanjeev Sagar was standing at the spot but did not report the incident to the police. There is no eye witness of the alleged murder.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicants submit that they are innocent and have been falsely implicated. It is contended by learned counsel that there is no evidence at all to connect either of the accused/applicants with the alleged murder and that there is no likelihood of conviction, but both of them are languishing in jail for past three and half years.



2026:DHC:2297



5. Learned APP for State on instructions of IO/Inspector Virender opposes the bail applications on the ground of seriousness of the offence. It is submitted by learned APP for State that all public witnesses already stand examined. According to prosecution, the circumstantial evidence to connect the accused/applicant is the evidence of last seen/heard and recovery of blood stained clothes as well as the evidence regarding deposit of Rs.44,000/- by the accused/applicant Naveen in the bank account of his wife through a private financier.

6. One wonders as to if the total amount robbed was almost Rs.50,000/-, out of which Rs.44,000/- was deposited by the accused/applicant Naveen in the bank account of his wife, why would the other accused/applicant Sanjeev Sagar remain silent spectator without sharing the robbed money. One also wonders as to why Naveen would deposit the money through a private financier instead of directly depositing the same in the bank. Of course, on these aspects, the learned trial court shall take independent view on the basis of evidence adduced during trial.

7. But for present purposes, keeping in mind the nature of evidence collected during investigation to connect the accused/applicants with the alleged offence and also keeping in mind that all public witnesses already stand examined and trial is not likely to conclude soon because there are about 30 more prosecution witnesses, I find no reason to further deprive the accused/applicants liberty.



2026:DHC:2297



8. Therefore, both these bail applications are allowed and accused/applicants are directed to be released on bail subject to their furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

9. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail Superintendent for informing these accused/applicants.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

MARCH 19, 2026/as