



2026:DHC:8162



\$~60

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

%

Date of Decision: 22.09.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4009/2026**

MR. AJAY SEHRAWAT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sumeet Singh Shokeen and Mr.
Kartikey Anand, Advocates.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
(*through videoconferencing*).

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. This application for extension of interim bail has been received by way of second supplementary list now at 03:50 pm.

2. The accused/applicant seeks an extension of interim bail for a period of four weeks in FIR No. 218/2021 of PS Model Town for offence under Section 302/308/325/323/341/506/188/269/34 IPC.

3. At the outset, learned counsel for accused/applicant was requested to disclose the previous interim bail applications and fate thereof. Learned



2026:DHC:8162



counsel for accused/applicant submitted that earlier before the trial court, the accused/applicant had filed four applications for grant of interim bail on account of some shoulder pain. Those four applications were allowed and interim bail was granted for different intervals. The 5th interim bail application was dismissed by the trial court. Thereafter, according to learned counsel for accused/applicant, the first interim bail application filed before this Court was allowed vide order dated 14.09.2026 by a coordinate bench of this Court, granting interim bail for a period of seven days. That period is expiring tomorrow, so now this interim bail application has been filed.

4. But learned APP for State appearing on advance intimation submits that learned counsel has not disclosed that earlier also, two interim bail applications were filed by the accused/applicant and the same were dismissed on 10.07.2024 and withdrawn on 25.04.2025. Copies of those orders also have not been filed.

5. By order dated 14.09.2026, interim bail of seven days was granted by the coordinate bench on the ground that surgery of shoulder of father of the accused/applicant was scheduled for 16.09.2026. It is submitted by learned counsel that since the said surgery got deferred to 24.09.2026, he has filed the present application. Regarding that aspect, learned counsel places reliance on the medical prescription placed at page 43 of the application. But that medical prescription is dated 18.09.2026, whereas the surgery for which the accused/applicant was granted interim bail was earlier stated to be



2026:DHC:8162



scheduled for 16.09.2026. If on 16.09.2026 father of the accused/applicant was not to be operated upon, he should have surrendered, but he opted to remain on interim bail and obtained fresh prescription on 18.09.2026 for postponement of surgery.

6. In order dated 14.09.2026, the coordinate bench also noted that the surgery to be undertaken by father of the accused/applicant is not a major surgery; that father of the accused/applicant is not in a critical condition; and that even otherwise, elder brother of the accused/applicant is available to take care of their father.

7. It clearly appears to be a case of effort on the part of the accused/applicant to evergreen interim liberty.

8. Therefore, the application is dismissed.

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

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

SEPTEMBER 22, 2026/dr