



2026:DHC:7098



\$~2

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

% *Date of Decision: 24.08.2026*

CNR No. DLHC010285492026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2526/2026**

MOHD ZAHID ALIAS HAFIZ ALIAS CHOTU ALIAS RAJU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amrendra Kumar Jha and
Mr. S.N. Shukla, Advocates

versus

STATE OF DELHI (N.C.T. OF DELHI)Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP
for State with SI Ramakant

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 413/2023 of PS Sadar Bazar for offence under Section 307/392/397/411/120B/34 IPC and Section 27/54/59 of Arms Act.

2. In furtherance of last order, status report was filed. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State, assisted by IO/SI Ramakant.



3. Broadly speaking, allegation against the accused/applicant is as follows. On 10.05.2023, when the complainant *de facto* Pawan and his colleague Baleshwar were returning towards Sadar Bazar after collecting payment of Rs. 55,55,000/- from Karol Bagh and they reached on their scooty at Nawab Road, two persons riding a motorcycle intercepted and robbed the cash at gunpoint. One of the robbers fired a shot in the air before fleeing. The role attributed to the present accused/applicant is that he was one of those two robbers.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the accused/applicant is in custody for past more than three years and till date, only four out of twenty-five prosecution witnesses have been examined in trial. It is also submitted that the alleged eyewitness in his testimony did not support case of prosecution. It is submitted by learned counsel that the only evidence against the accused/applicant is the alleged confession of co-accused who was in police custody. It is also submitted that Pawan as well as Baleshwar in their testimony before the trial court have not identified the accused/applicant.

5. Learned APP for State submits that the only evidence against the accused/applicant is that the alleged robbery was captured in CCTV, which clearly depicts the accused/applicant as the person snatching the money bag from the complainant *de facto* and firing a shot in the air.



2026:DHC:7098



6. But the IO has not brought the CCTV footage that allegedly depicts the robbery. Instead, the IO has produced before me few still pictures, alleging the same to be of the accused persons. None of those pictures depict the alleged incident of robbery. Those pictures at the most depict 2-3 persons walking on the road and the person pointed out by the IO to be the accused/applicant is wearing a cap as well as a mask, so from that picture, nothing can be made out.

7. Consequently, the only material against the accused/applicant is the alleged confession of the co-accused.

8. Learned APP for State further submits that the accused/applicant also has bad antecedents in the sense that he is involved in 13 more cases. To this, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that in all those cases, the accused/applicant is either on bail or stands acquitted or those offences stand compounded.

9. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find any reason to deprive further 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/Duty Magistrate.



2026:DHC:7098



10. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 24, 2026/as