



2026:DHC:8287



\$~6

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision : 24.09.2026

CNR No.DLHC010209692026

+ BAIL APPLN. 1847/2026, CRL.M.A.14915/2026

RAVI @ ANGODA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishabh Kant Sharma and
Mr. Divyansh Sharma, Advocates.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for State.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA****SACHIN DATTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The applicant/petitioner who is an accused in FIR No.14/2021 dated 10.01.2021 registered at Police Station Subhash Place, Delhi, under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter 'IPC'), seeks regular bail.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that the petitioner's bail application was dismissed by the learned ASJ-03, North-West, Rohini Courts, Delhi, on 30.01.2026.
3. It is pointed out that the applicant/petitioner was arrested on 14.01.2021 and has been in judicial custody for over 5 years and 9 months.
4. It is further pointed out that the charge-sheet cites 24 witnesses, of whom, 18 witnesses have been examined.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner points out that remaining witnesses are formal or official and that there is uncertainty as to the time-



2026:DHC:8287



frame that will be required for the trial to conclude.

6. No doubt the offence of which the applicant/petitioner is charged is grave. However, considering the period which the petitioner has already spent in incarceration and considering that the material witnesses have already been examined, this Court is inclined to release the applicant/petitioner on bail.

7. The Supreme Court in **Union of India v. K.A. Najeeb**, (2021) 3 SCC 713, held as under:

*“15. This Court has clarified in numerous judgments that the liberty guaranteed by Part III of the Constitution would cover within its protective ambit not only due procedure and fairness but also access to justice and a speedy trial. In Supreme Court Legal Aid Committee (Representing Undertrial Prisoners) v. Union of India [Supreme Court Legal Aid Committee (Representing Undertrial Prisoners) v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 731, para 15 : 1995 SCC (Cri) 39] , it was held that undertrials cannot indefinitely be detained pending trial. Ideally, no person ought to suffer adverse consequences of his acts unless the same is established before a neutral arbiter. However, owing to the practicalities of real life where to secure an effective trial and to ameliorate the risk to society in case a potential criminal is left at large pending trial, the courts are tasked with deciding whether an individual ought to be released pending trial or not. **Once it is obvious that a timely trial would not be possible and the accused has suffered incarceration for a significant period of time, the courts would ordinarily be obligated to enlarge them on bail.**”*

8. In **Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh v. State of Maharashtra**, (2024) 9 SCC 813, the Supreme Court observed as under:

“7. Having regard to the aforesaid, we wonder by what period of time, the trial will ultimately conclude. Howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has a right to speedy trial as enshrined under the Constitution of India. Over a period of time, the trial courts and the High Courts have forgotten a very well-settled principle of law that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment.

8. In the aforesaid context, we may remind the trial courts and the High Courts of what came to be observed by this Court in Gudikanti Narasimhulu v. High Court of A.P. [Gudikanti Narasimhulu v. High



2026:DHC:8287



Court of A.P., (1978) 1 SCC 240 : 1978 SCC (Cri) 115] We quote : (SCC p. 243, para 5)

“5. ... What is often forgotten, and therefore warrants reminder, is the object to keep a person in judicial custody pending trial or disposal of an appeal. Lord Russel, C.J., said R. v. Rose [R. v. Rose, (1898) 18 Cox CC 717] :

‘I observe that in this case bail was refused for the prisoner. It cannot be too strongly impressed on the magistracy of the country that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment, but that the requirements as to bail are merely to secure the attendance of the prisoner at trial.’ ”

9. The same principle has been reiterated by this Court in Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab [Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565 : 1980 SCC (Cri) 465] that the object of bail is to secure the attendance of the accused at the trial, that the proper test to be applied in the solution of the question whether bail should be granted or refused is whether it is probable that the party will appear to take his trial and that it is indisputable that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment.”

9. Accordingly, the applicant/petitioner is admitted to regular bail on furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/-, with two sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The applicant/petitioner shall not leave NCT of Delhi or travel out of the country, without prior permission of the Trial Court;
- ii. The applicant/petitioner shall provide his permanent address to the Trial Court, as also the address where he will be residing during the pendency of the case;
- iii. The applicant/petitioner shall intimate the Investigating Officer (I.O.), and file an affidavit before the Trial Court, regarding any change in his residential address;
- iv. The applicant/petitioner shall furnish his mobile number to the



2026:DHC:8287



I.O./Station House Officer concerned, which shall be kept in working condition at all times. The mobile number shall be kept switched on, with location services enabled at all times, and the same shall be shared with the I.O. The mobile number shall not be changed without prior intimation to the I.O., during the pendency of the trial;

- v. The applicant/petitioner shall not directly or indirectly contact the complainant, the family members of the deceased;
 - vi. The applicant/petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;
 - vii. The applicant/petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every date of hearing;
 - viii. The applicant/petitioner shall not indulge in any criminal activity during the period of bail; and
 - ix. The applicant/petitioner shall report to the concerned SHO, on the first Monday of every month at 11:00 a.m. and shall be discharged by 12:00 noon after recording his presence and completion of the necessary formalities.
10. The application is disposed of in the above terms. Pending application also stands disposed of.
11. The Trial Court is requested to expedite the trial proceedings.
12. It is clarified that the observations made herein are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and shall neither influence the trial proceedings nor be construed as an expression of opinion of this



2026:DHC:8287



Court on the merits of the case.

13. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent electronically for information and necessary compliance.

SACHIN DATTA, J

SEPTEMBER 24, 2026

r, ss