



2026:DHC:6957



\$~65

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

% *Date of Decision: 20.08.2026*

CNR No. DLHC010388542026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3440/2026 & CRL.M.A. 25611/2026**

ASHU PAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raghav Sharma and Mr.
Vishvendra Singh, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with Investigating Officer/Inspector
Amit 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. 519/2019 of PS Prem Nagar for offence under Section 302/201/34 IPC.

2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP



2026:DHC:6957



for State assisted by Investigating Officer/Inspector Amit Kumar.

3. Broadly speaking, allegation against the accused/applicant is that on 22.02.2019, the accused/applicant went to the police station and stated that he had killed his wife and had chopped off her body into pieces and thereafter, dumped those pieces of dead body in a septic tank. While the accused/applicant was being interrogated in the police station, a PCR call was received from brother of the deceased stating that she had been killed and her body was recovered from the septic tank. On the basis of statement of brother of the deceased, the FIR was registered. In his complaint, brother of the deceased stated that since the deceased gave birth to three daughters, the present accused/applicant and his family members used to torture her and also used to demand dowry. Further, even on 21.09.2019, the accused/applicant called up mother of the deceased and informed her that he had murdered his wife, though the mother of the deceased did not take it seriously on that day but on next day when brother of the deceased visited house of the accused/applicant, he found blood stains and found the dead body in the septic tank.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that there are vital contradictions in the testimony of mother and brother of the deceased, but admittedly, while considering the bail application, the court shall not carry out minute analysis of the evidence on record.



2026:DHC:6957



4.1 Another contention raised by learned counsel for accused/applicant is that he never visited the police station to confess, as wrongly projected by the investigating agency. But on this aspect also, he fairly admits that in the previous bail orders, no such contention on behalf of the accused/applicant was recorded.

4.2 It is also contended on behalf of the accused/applicant that the trial is proceeding on a very slow pace, so the accused/applicant deserves bail.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for State submits that the trial is not at all slow in pace and the allegations against the accused/applicant disentitle him of bail. It is submitted that the blood-stained weapon allegedly used in chopping off the dead body of the deceased and her clothes/jewellery, etc. also were recovered and were examined forensically.

6. Of course, delay in trial is a ground for grant of bail. But that is not the only ground. While considering grant or denial of bail, the court cannot shut its eyes to the gruesome manner in which a lady was killed followed by chopping off of her body and throwing her in the septic tank.

7. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant bail to the accused/applicant. Therefore, the bail application is dismissed. Accompanying application also stands dismissed.



2026:DHC:6957



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

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 20, 2026/ry