



\$~52

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

% *Date of Decision: 21.01.2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 260/2026, CRL.M.A. 2134/2026, 2135/2026 & 2136/2026**

SUPHIYAN ALI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bibek Tripathi, Mr. Manoj Kumar and Mr. Subhakar Tiwari, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF GNCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State with SI Narender Singh, PS CR Park.

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

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

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 357/2024 of PS Chitranjan Park for offence under Section 309(6)/310(2)/311/317 (3)/61(2)/3(5) BNS and Section 25/27 Arms Act.

2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Narender Singh.



2026:DHC:504



3. Broadly speaking, the complainant *de facto*, who is engaged in business of jewellery, was allegedly robbed at his home by 3-4 persons carrying a toy gun. In the process they allegedly snatched anklet of his wife and fled away. The FIR narrates the incident that on 28.11.2024 at about 08:30 pm when the complainant *de facto* was present at his home, on hearing some commotion from the side of the kitchen, he went there and found his servant on opening the door. The said servant Harish had been caught hold of by 3-4 persons and one of them was carrying a pistol (*which turned out to be a toy gun*). Those intruders rushed inside the home with the intention to commit robbery and they also threatened wife of the complainant *de facto* who was standing behind him. The intruders allegedly threatened wife of the complainant *de facto* to hand over the entire money and gold, otherwise they would kill her. Thereafter, one of the robbers hit on head of the complainant *de facto* and another robber snatched out anklet from foot of wife of the complainant *de facto* and they ran away.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the manner in which the incident had been alleged is completely unbelievable insofar as it cannot be believed that 3-4 persons armed with pistol would enter house of a jeweller and leave after taking only one anklet, that too, after snatching out the same from foot of wife of the complainant *de facto*. It is also pointed out that there is a delay of two days in even lodging the complaint and co-accused Salim, Arman Ali and Laiq Ahamad have already been granted bail. Learned counsel for accused/applicant has taken me through Annexure P-7, which is a copy of the bail order dated 07.01.2026 passed by me, pointing



out the observation that the CCTV footage presents a completely distinct picture of the incident.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for State contends that role of the present accused/applicant is different from role of Laiq Ahamad in the sense that the latter was only keeping a watch outside the house while the accused/applicant was carrying a toy gun.

6. The fact remains that as described in order dated 07.01.2026 quoted above, there is serious doubt about truthfulness of contents of the FIR in the light of the CCTV footage. There is also an unexplained delay of two days in lodging the complaint. It also remains a mystery as to why so many persons, some of whom are armed would enter the house of a jeweller and flee away after snatching out anklet from foot of his wife and nothing else. The manner in which the incident is depicted in the CCTV footage has been described in order dated 07.01.2026 whereby the accused Laiq Ahamad was granted bail.

7. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find any 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 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.



2026:DHC:504



9. Of course, nothing observed in this order shall be read to the prejudice of either side at the final stage of the trial.

10. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**JANUARY 21, 2026/as**