



2026:DHC:7182



\$~48

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

% *Date of Decision: 25.08.2026*

CNR No. DLHC010400902026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3529/2026, CRL.M.A. 26316/2026 & CRL.M.A. 26317/2026**

NEERAJ (THROUGH PAIROKAR)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikram Singh Nayal, Advocate
(*through videoconferencing*).

versus

THE STATE OF GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with SI Manjit Singh, PS Punjabi
Bagh.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 636/2023 of Police Station Punjabi Bagh for offence under Section 120B/395/412/397/34 IPC.



2026:DHC:7182



2. Learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Manjit Singh accepts notice and submits that the application can be heard and disposed of today itself.
3. Broadly speaking, the allegation of prosecution is that three persons including the present accused/applicant committed robbery on 30.09.2023 by snatching money bag of the complainant *de facto* after brandishing a country made pistol. The role attributed to the present accused/applicant is that he was driving the motorcycle on which the remaining two accused were pillion riders.
4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that he is in jail since 16.10.2023 and till date, even charges have not been framed. It is also submitted that the accused/applicant is entitled to bail also on the ground of parity with the co-accused Sagar, who also had the similar alleged role and was granted bail by this Court on 13.07.2026.
5. Admittedly, the person who brandished the country made pistol was co-accused Vinod and not the present accused/applicant or the co-accused Sagar. That being so, learned APP for State admits that there is parity between the present accused/applicant and co-accused Sagar. But learned APP also contends that the only difference between Sagar and the present accused/applicant is that the present accused/applicant has objectionable antecedents of previous involvement. However, so far as previous



2026:DHC:7182



involvement is concerned, the present accused/applicant is on bail in those cases as per both sides.

6. At this stage, learned APP also submits that part of the robbed amount was recovered from the present accused/applicant along with a mobile phone purchased by him from the robbed money; and that even the motorbike used in the offence was a stolen one. But in my view, same is the status of Sagar also in the sense that from Sagar also, a part of the robbed amount was recovered.

7. Keeping in mind the above circumstances, the accused/applicant cannot be denied parity with co-accused Sagar, who was granted bail by this Court.

8. Therefore, the bail application is allowed and the accused/applicant is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. As suggested by learned APP, it is directed that the accused/applicant shall not contact any of the prosecution witnesses in any manner, whatsoever.



2026:DHC:7182



10. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.
11. Accompanying applications also stand disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 25, 2026/dr