



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

%

*Reserved on: 13th August, 2025
Pronounced on: 25th September, 2025*

+

BAIL APPLN. 1724/2025

MOHD TAHIR HUSSAIN

S/o Kallan Saifi

E-7, Main Karawal Nagar

Road, New Delhi - 110094

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Mohan, Ms. Tara Narula,
Ms. Shivangi, Mr. Hamendra,
Ms. Sonal and Mr. Shrey Sharma,
Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

Through SHO,

PS Dayalpur

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Nair, SPP with Mr. Dhruv
Pande, Advocate with Insp. Priyanka,
Crime Branch, Sunlight Colony, Insp.
Amit Prakash, PS: Lajpat Nagar and
Insp. Amteshwer, PS: Vigilance.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

J U D G M E N T

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

1. Fifth Bail Application under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the Applicant *Mohd. Tahir Hussain* seeking Bail in FIR No.065/2020 under Sections



147/148/153A/365/302/188 read with Sections 149/120B IPC, registered at P.S. Dayalpur, Delhi.

2. It is submitted that the Applicant is in judicial custody since 16.03.2020. The Chargesheet has already been filed and the Charges under Sections 147/148/153A/365/302/188 read with Sections 149/120B IPC have already been framed vide Order dated 23.03.2023. The matter is pending at the stage of prosecution witness. Out of 11 accused persons, 8 (including two accused persons Haseen Mullaji and Sameer Khan, who alleged to have committed the murder, have been granted bail. Previous Bail Application filed by the Applicant was dismissed on 12.03.2025 by the learned Trial Court.

3. It is submitted that FIR was registered on 26.02.2020, on Compliant of Ravinder Kumar regarding kidnapping of his son Ankit Sharma, an erstwhile office of Intelligence Bureau (IB), on 25.02.2020 at about 05:00 PM, during riots in North-East District of Delhi, in the aftermath of the enactment of the Citizenship Amendment Act, 2019 (CAA) and National Register of Citizens (NRC). Dead body of Ankit Sharma was found lying in a drain near Chand Bagh Pulia, having sustained sharp injuries on his head, face, chest, back and on his waist. The Applicant was already in custody in *FIR No.0101/2020*, PS: Khajuri Khas and was arrested in present FIR on 16.03.2020.

4. The case of the prosecution against him is that he provoked and instigated Muslims against Hindus and promoted enmity on the grounds of religion between them and the uncontrolled mob turned into rioters. In process of rioting, the mob caught hold of deceased Ankit Sharma and



dragged him to Chand Bagh Pulia and inflicted injuries using sharp and blunt objects/ weapons which resulted in his death by and then they threw his dead body in the nala.

5. The Order of learned ASJ rejecting *the Bail Application has been challenged on the ground* that the material change in circumstances in favour of the Applicant has not been considered by erroneously relying on the first Order of rejection of Bail dated 13.07.2020. The Bail has been rejected simply by making an observation that the Applicant should approach the higher Courts in view of previous rejections, without appreciating the material change in circumstances in his favour. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its split verdict on the prayer for Interim Bail for the purpose of participating in the Delhi Assembly Elections 2025 has considered the favorable circumstances, which have not been considered by the learned Trial Court.

6. There were five public eye-witnesses, first was PW6/Pradeep Verma who has deposed that he did not see the Applicant in the mob on 25.02.2020; second witness PW11/Deepak Pradhan has categorically stated that at the time of the alleged incident, he remained inside the temple and could not see what was happening outside; and witnesses *PW-13 and PW-14, namely Akash and Bharat @ Kalu* failed to tender any plausible explanation as to why they appeared before police after a period of considerable delay. Further, the manner in which they deposed also cast doubt on their presence at the scene of crime.

7. PW19/Vikalp Kochar and PW21/Gyanendra Kochar who gave an eyewitness account of the entire incident, also did not name the Applicant as



present at the place of occurrence. Further, these eye-witnesses have denied that they had identified any person or mentioned about the presence of such person in the mob at the place of occurrence or had on provocation of the Applicant stabbed the deceased.

8. Thus, out of the five public eyewitnesses examined by the Prosecution, three witnesses, i.e. PW19/Vikalp Kochar, PW21/Gyanendra Kochar and PW37/Surender Pal Sengar, have not implicated the Applicant. PW28/the Complainant/father of the deceased, has also not implicated the Applicant and has refused to identify the Complaint on the basis of which present FIR has been registered.

9. So far as the testimony of alleged police eyewitnesses is concerned, the same also suffer from major improvements and contradictions and cannot be relied upon as credible evidence against the Applicant. It is further submitted that the role ascribed to the Applicant is that of an instigator and conspirator and is not shown to be part of mob or an active participant involved in the killing of deceased.

10. Learned Trial Court has considered this fact in FIR No.0114/2020 PS: Khajuri Khas which also pertains to the incident of rioting and arson on 25.02.2020 in the same vicinity and around the same time as the present case and has granted Bail to the Applicant. The said FIR also reports incident of rioting and arson on the same day, of the same vicinity and around the same time as the present case. Hence, the same weighs in favour of the Applicant.

11. Out of the 11 accused persons, 8 have been granted bail including 2 co-accused persons, except Haseen Mullaji and Sameer Khan who were



alleged to have committed the murder. The Applicant as on date has spent more than 5 years in judicial custody. He has been implicated in 12 cases related to North-East Delhi riots, wherein he has been granted bail in nine of them and one FIR has been quashed by this Court.

12. It is further submitted that the prosecution has not brought forth any credible evidence which could even remotely suggest that the Applicant was involved in the alleged incident. The prosecution is relying on statements under Section 161 CrPC of certain witnesses to ascribe the role of instigator and co-conspirator to the Applicant. However, during trial most of the said prosecution witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution.

13. There are about 114 prosecution witnesses, out of which 59 have been examined so far. The trial has been expedited, but despite the best efforts of the learned Trial Court, the conclusion of the trial may take time. In any case, expedition of trial does not disentitle the Applicant from the benefit of bail. As all the material witnesses stand examined, there is no apprehension of the Applicant tampering with evidence or influencing any witness.

14. In the light of significant changes in circumstances in the favour of the Applicant, previous dismissals of his Bail Applications cannot be taken as a factor for rejection of Bail by learned ASJ.

15. It is further submitted that this Court has granted benefit of Bail to co-accused persons, who have been alleged to be a part of murder and allegedly have been active participants in the killing of the deceased person. The prosecution has ascribed the role of merely *an instigator and co-conspirator to the Applicant*, while allegations against other accused persons are more severe, but they have been granted Bail.



16. The Applicant submits that he satisfies the *triple test* laid down by the Apex Court in the case of P. Chidambaram vs. Directorate of Enforcement, 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1549, as he is not a flight risk and has no chance of tampering with evidence or influencing the witnesses. He is a permanent resident of Delhi with family and has deep roots in society. No further purpose would be served either in investigation or prosecution by keeping him in judicial custody.

17. Furthermore, the evidence on record reflects that there is no prima facie or reasonable ground to believe that the Applicant has committed the offence, as alleged. The incarceration during investigation and trial has to be based on more than surmises and apprehensions of the police. He must be treated as innocent until proven otherwise, since *bail not jail*, is the primary rule.

18. It is further contended that the Applicant is suffering from multiple illnesses and his health is constantly deteriorating, due to continuing incarceration. He had undergone cataract surgery and requires ample post-surgery care. He also has a defect of size 2.3 cm in the anterior abdominal wall in supraumbilical region through which fat is seen herniating.

19. *Thus, the Applicant is seeking Bail on humanitarian ground.*

20. **Status Report** has been filed on behalf of the State wherein it is stated that on 25.02.2020, as per the Complaint of Ravinder Kumar, his son Ankit Sharma who was posted in Intelligence Bureau, had come home from office and had gone out to bring some household goods at about 05:00 PM. He did not return for a long time and a search was made by him in nearby places, hospitals, etc., but could not be found.



21. After waiting over night, he lodged a missing report *vide* GD No.009-A dated 26.02.2020 at 11:41 AM, in regard to his son Ankit Sharma. He then came to know from local boys that his son had been thrown into Khajuri Khas Nala from the Chand Bagh Pulia Masjid, after killing him. The dead body of Ankit Sharma was recovered from that Nala. His clothes were missing and only underwear was on his body.

22. The Complainant expressed strong suspicion that his son had been killed by the Applicant and his accomplices, who had gathered at his office and after killing his son, had thrown his body in the nala from masjid.

23. The investigations were undertaken by the Police. *51 injuries were found on the dead body, as per the Post-Mortem Report.* The investigations were transferred to SIT of Crime Branch by Order of Senior Officers on 28.02.2020. *The Chargesheet got filed in the Court on 02.06.2020.*

24. It is stated that prosecution witnesses *HC Rahul and Constable Praveen Kumar*, Beat Constables of PS Khajuri Khas, had identified the Applicant in their statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. recorded on 09.03.2020. They stated that on 25.02.2020, the Applicant was involved in instigating the mob involved in the act of rioting and arson and were pelting stones on the group of Hindus and setting ablaze their shops on the instigation of the Applicant.

25. *PW5/HC Rahul* was examined on 17.08.2023, who supported the case of the Prosecution. The role of the Applicant was similarly stated in the examination-in-chief of *PW11/Deepak Pradhan*, who saw stones and petrol bombs being pelted from the house of the Applicant on 25.02.2020 at about 05:00 PM. Likewise, *PW14/Bharat*, *PW56/ Priyanka Gaur*, *PW66/Neeraj*



Singh and PW68/Rohtash Singh have deposed against the Applicant. Moreover, presence of the Applicant at the spot on 25.02.2020 at the time of incident has been confirmed by his mobile phone location.

26. It is asserted that the present offence is not a simple offence committed at the spur of moment. It is evident that it was a deep rooted and pre-conceived strategy/plan of the Applicant, who along with other accused, perpetrated the riots and sought to massacre the members of Hindu community. His house was used as a fort to attack the members of Hindu community. He was leading the rioters, who were present on the rooftop of his house from where they were pelting stones, bricks and petrol bombs on the Hindus. The Witnesses have also stated that the Applicant was provoking and instigating the mob against the Hindus / *Kafirs* to kill them, who thereafter, started burning shops and pelting stones/petrol bombs.

27. The planning to perpetrate violence becomes clear from the fact that the Applicant who is the main accused, before start of the riots has shifted his family from his house in Khajuri Khas to his parental house at Mustafabad. He, however, stayed back at his house from where he perpetrated the riots.

28. Furthermore, the Applicant had licensed pistol and 100 rounds, which was deposited in the PS Khajuri Khas on 07.01.2020 and he got it released on 22.02.2020, i.e. just before the riots, for the sole purpose of using the same in the riots. During interrogation, he failed to give any satisfactory reply regarding timing of release of the pistol from the Police Station. During investigations, only 64 live cartridges and 22 empty cartridges out of 100 rounds were recovered at his instance. He could not give account of



remaining 14 live cartridges and 22 empty / fired cartridges, as to when and where the same were used / fired.

29. Roof-top of the Applicant's house was stacked with stones, bricks and petrol bombs and acid drums, which were used in the riots and videos of the same were widely circulated in the media. Bottles were found which were used to throw Molotov cocktail on members of Hindu Community and riot control Police party. Various bottles and stones etc. had been seized from the scene of crime. FSL Report proved that those bottles contained either acid or kerosene oil.

30. Furthermore, this incident which occurred in the vicinity of the said area resulted in registration of five FIRs, reflecting the gruesome nature of the crimes. It is further submitted that the Applicant did not cooperate during the investigations and remained evasive and non-cooperative.

31. Bail Application is opposed as there is reasonable ground to believe that the Applicant has committed the offence. The nature and gravity of the accusation, which have been duly corroborated by various prosecution witnesses, do not justify the ground of bail. Moreover, there is a danger of him absconding or fleeing after his release on bail. The Applicant resides in the same vicinity as the deceased. There is every likelihood that he may threaten the Complainant or influence the witnesses and may even try to jump bail. The punishment, i.e. imprisonment for life/death penalty, which is the maximum that can be awarded to the Applicant, may stimulate him to commit such heinous crimes in future.

32. It is also submitted that the Applicant in FIR No.0114/2020 registered at PS: Khajuri Khas, which also pertains to North-East Delhi riots, tried to



influence the public witnesses, i.e. Md. Ikrar, who had been dropped from the list of prosecution witnesses. This witness rather appeared as DW-1 to depose that the mob did not pelt stones and he had not seen the Applicant in the mob. He, in his cross-examination, denied knowing Shariq Hussain S/o Md. Tahir Hussain. Even though till the month of May on two occasions, he met Shariq Hussain, one of which day was only one day before his deposition before the Court. The mobile phone was taken into possession by the Court and sent to CERT-In for expert opinion. It came to the notice that he was in constant conversation with Shariq Hussain on Whatsapp and all the chats were deleted by Shariq Hussain. Therefore, the content of the chats could not be retrieved. *It is evident that the Applicant had been trying to influence the witnesses during the trial.*

33. Section 149 IPC has been invoked in the present case, the Applicant is liable for the criminal acts committed by any member of that illegal mob gathered on 25.02.2020. Total 79 witnesses have already been examined out of which many witnesses have identified the Applicant Tahir Hussain, as part of the mob and instigating them. There is every possibility of his being convicted and, in this fear; he may flee if granted bail.

34. In the end, it is submitted that he is an influential person and he along with his associates, was instrumental in the riots and murder of Complainant's son Ankit Sharma.

35. *Bail is therefore, opposed.*

Submissions heard and record perused.

36. Detailed submissions advanced by the learned Counsel on behalf of the Appellant, as well as by the learned SPP appearing for the State, have



been considered and record has been perused, including the Chargesheet, statements of witnesses, and the Impugned Order of the learned Trial Court.

37. This is the ***fifth Bail Application*** filed by the Applicant in connection with FIR No. 65/2020, registered for Offences including rioting and the murder of Ankit Sharma, an officer of the Intelligence Bureau. The Applicant has been in judicial custody since 16.03.2020.

38. The murder of the victim/Ankit Sharma, which is the subject matter of the present FIR 65/2020, cannot be viewed as a standalone incident or a spontaneous act of violence. Rather, it was contextualized as a direct and foreseeable off-shoot of the larger criminal conspiracy whereby communal riots were organized in Delhi in respect of which eleven FIRs got registered. It was a premeditated and well-orchestrated conspiracy, allegedly hatched between several accused persons, of which the Applicant/Tahir Hussain was the mastermind. He in a well-planned manner had shifted his family well in time. The prosecution alleges that the Applicant's house near Chand Bagh Pulia was allegedly identified as a key protest and riot site in the larger conspiracy. It was used as a "fort" and an operational base to attack members of the Hindu community. The recovery of stones, petrol bombs, acid, and slingshots from his rooftop, and testimonies of witnesses seeing these items being pelted, directly correspond to the planned stockpiling and use of such items as part of the larger conspiracy.

39. The conspiracy involved escalating the anti-CAA/NRC protests into chakka-jams and violent riots, particularly during the state visit of the US President, to garner international attention. The events leading to the murder



of Ankit Sharma on 25.02.2020 at Chand Bagh Pulia align precisely with the methods and objectives of this larger conspiracy.

40. A primary objective of the larger conspiracy was to incite widespread communal violence by propagating a misleading narrative against the CAA/NRC. In the present case, multiple eyewitnesses, namely PW5/HC Rahul, PW13/Aakash and PW14/Bharat have testified that the Applicant/Tahir Hussain, was seen instigating the mob with communally charged slogans moments before and during the assault on Ankit Sharma, stating that Hindus had killed Muslims and that “*Kafirs had to be taught a lesson*”. This act of incitement is a direct consequence of the conspiracy’s alleged goal.

41. According to the prosecution, the role of the Applicant/Tahir Hussain was that of an instigator and facilitator in the murder of Ankit Sharma.

42. Therefore, the incident in the present FIR 65/2020 is not merely an ancillary crime, but a gruesome manifestation of the larger conspiracy. The dragging of Ankit Sharma by an enraged mob, his brutal murder with 51 injuries, and the subsequent disposal of his body in a drain, defines the gravity of the offence. Viewing this incident as an off-shoot of the larger conspiracy is essential to appreciate its full gravity and the *prima facie* role of the Applicant within it.

43. Now, as noted by the Apex Court in State of U.P. vs. Amarmani Tripathi, (2005) 8 SCC 21, the factors to be considered while granting or refusing Bail in a case of this nature are well-settled. The Court must consider, among other circumstances: (i) the existence of a *prima facie* case against the accused; (ii) the nature and gravity of the accusation; (iii)



the severity of the punishment upon conviction; (iv) the danger of the accused absconding; (v) the character and standing of the accused; (vi) the likelihood of the offence being repeated, and; (vii) the reasonable apprehension of witnesses being influenced.

44. The Prosecution's case is that the Applicant was not merely a part of the rioting mob, but was a prime instigator and conspirator who facilitated the communal riots that took place in North-East Delhi in February 2020. It is alleged that the Applicant provoked and instigated persons from the Muslim community against the Hindu community, leading to the murder of Ankit Sharma.

45. The Prosecution has claimed that the Applicant's house was used as an operational base or "fort" to launch attacks on members of the Hindu community. From the rooftop, stones, bricks, acid, and petrol bombs were allegedly pelted on the crowd below. During a search of the Applicant's house and terrace, police found catapults, petrol bottles, and stones, which lends credence to these allegations.

46. Several witnesses have directly implicated the Applicant. PW-5/HC Rahul testified that he saw the applicant at Chand Bagh pulia raising slogans, stating that Hindus had killed Muslims and burnt their shops, and that "*Hindu Kafirs*" must be taught a lesson. He deposed that upon hearing these slogans, the mob became aggressive, started pelting stones, and set nearby shops ablaze. He also saw the mob drag one person from the Hindu side towards Chand Bagh pulia. He identified the Applicant in court.

47. PW13/Aakash stated that he saw the Applicant giving an instigating speech in front of a mosque, claiming Hindus had vandalized shops and



molested women, and that “*Kafirs had to be taught a lesson*”. He further testified to seeing the applicant with a knife in his hand, actively participating in the assault of an IB Officer/ deceased Ankit Sharma and in the act of getting him thrown into the drain.

48. PW14/Bharat corroborated this, stating he saw the Applicant in front of the mosque shouting “*maaro maaro*” (kill, kill) while a boy was being assaulted by 20-25 people and subsequently thrown into the drain.

49. PW56/Priyanka Gaur also identified the applicant and stated that from his body language and gestures, she could see him instigating the mob to move forward towards Dayalpur. PW28/Ravinder Kumar, the father of the deceased, stated in the FIR that he had a strong suspicion that his son was killed by Tahir Hussain and his accomplices.

50. The *planning to perpetrate violence* is suggested by the fact that the Applicant had allegedly shifted his family from his house before the riots began but stayed back himself. Furthermore, he had his licensed pistol and 100 rounds of ammunition released from Police Station Khajuri Khas on 22.02.2020, just before the riots, and could not provide a satisfactory account for 14 live and 22 fired cartridges. This act, timed right before the outbreak of violence, points towards a premeditated plan.

51. The Applicant’s counsel argued that several public witnesses have not supported the case of the Prosecution or have turned hostile. However, at the Bail stage, the court cannot conduct a mini-trial or delve deep into the appreciation of evidence. The testimonies of witnesses who have directly implicated the Applicant cannot be ignored. The statements of PW5/HC Rahul, PW13/Aakash, PW14/Bharat, and PW56/Priyanka Gaur, among



others, form a strong basis to believe, *prima facie*, that the Applicant was not only a passive participant but a key figure in the events that transpired.

52. The Supreme Court in NIA vs. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali, (2019) 5 SCC 1, and reiterated in Gurwinder Singh v. State of Punjab, (2024) 5 SCC 403, has laid down elaborate guidelines on the approach that the Courts must partake. The Court is not required to conduct an elaborate examination or dissection of the evidence, but is merely expected to record a finding on the basis of broad probabilities regarding the involvement of the accused. The totality of the material gathered by the investigating agency is to be considered as a whole, and the contents of the documents are to be presumed as true, at this stage.

53. *The main ground for seeking bail by the Applicant is on the ground of long incarceration* and delay in conclusion of the trial. It is contended that the Applicant is in judicial custody since 16.03.2020 i.e. for over five years and 79 witnesses have been already recorded. There is no reason for his further detention, which in the given circumstances, is nothing but pre-trial conviction.

54. It need not be emphasized that while a speedy trial is the constitutional right of every accused, prolonged incarceration cannot be the sole ground for granting bail in a case of this magnitude, which involves allegations of orchestrating large-scale communal violence resulting in the brutal murder of an Intelligence Bureau officer. Long incarceration in itself ought not to lead to enlargement on bail when the facts *prima facie* show involvement in grave and serious offences. In cases involving large-scale communal riots, threatening the unity, integrity, and sovereignty of the



country, the interest of national security and public order must be balanced against individual rights.

55. As held by this Court recently in Tasleem Ahmed vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2025:DHC:7659-DB, delay cannot be the sole factor for the grant of bail, especially when the gravity of the offence or the role played by the accused is significant.

56. In Gobarbhai Naranbhai Singala v. State of Gujarat, (2008) 3 SCC 775, the Apex Court while relying upon State of Amarmani Tripathi, (supra) has observed that long period of incarceration cannot, itself be the ground for grant of Bail.

57. In the context of alleged delay, reference be made to the case of the co-accused Nazim vs. State (NCT of Delhi), SLP(Crl.) 12317/2024 wherein vide its Order dated 20-01-2025, the Apex Court had directed to Trial Court to conclude the Trial in a period of six months and had observed as under:

“3. We direct that the trial court shall take all steps to ensure that the trial is concluded and the parties do not delay proceedings. Considering the fact that the trial is on the verge of completion, we are not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. However, we grant the petitioner liberty to renew his prayer for bail at the expiry of the 6 months period.

4. We make it clear that parties will endeavour to complete the trial without seeking unnecessary adjournments. We also make it clear that in the event the petitioner delays the completion of the trial, he will forfeit the right to renew the prayer, as observed by us, hereinabove.”

58. However, the same could not be concluded within the given timeframe and the co-accused Nazim/Petitioner again moved *Miscellaneous Application No. 1365/2025* on 08.08.2025 the Apex Court for grant of Bail.



The Petition was disposed of by observing that the Trial is at its fag end and the timeframe for conclusion of the Trial was extended by three more months. It was held that *“time-frame of three months is directed for conclusion of the trial, failing which the petitioner is at liberty to move for bail by making an application before this Court.”*

59. The Prosecution has submitted that pursuant to the statement made by the State before the Supreme Court, almost all the material evidence have been examined and the trial is most likely to be concluded within the given time frame.

60. The trial is almost concluded and is at fag end. Therefore, the alleged prolonged trial cannot be a ground for bail.

61. The next main argument of the Applicant is his claim for **parity with 8 co-accused persons who have been granted Bail**, including two, who were alleged to have directly participated in the murder.

62. However, the principle of parity applies only when the role of the accused is similar to that of the co-accused who has been granted bail. In the present case, the allegations against the Applicant are far more serious and place him in a distinct category.

63. *The Applicant is not just alleged to be a member of the mob, but the main conspirator who instigated, facilitated, and provided his own house as a base for the riots.*

64. In view of the factual matrix and the *prima facie* evidence on record, it is found that the accusations against the Applicant are extremely grave, indicating his pivotal role in the conspiracy and execution of the riots, which



resulted in the murder of Ankit Sharma. *This key role distinguishes him from other accused persons.*

65. Finally, *the conduct of the accused during trial of criminal cases arising out of North-East Delhi Riots cannot be ignored.* The Status Report details an instance in FIR No. 0114/2020, where the Applicant allegedly attempted to influence a public witness through his son. Such conduct weighs heavily against him being granted the Bail.

66. The testimony of eyewitnesses, the circumstances pointing to a premeditated plan, and the Applicant's past conduct of attempting to influence a witness in a related matter, all weigh heavily against the grant of Bail.

67. *In light of the foregoing reasons, the Applicant is held not entitled to Bail.*

68. It is made clear that any observations made hereinabove are not an expression on the merits of the case. It is further clarified that these observations shall not, in any manner, influence the trial before the learned Trial Court, as they have been made solely for the purpose of examining the Bail Application of the Applicant.

69. Accordingly, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, and in view of the foregoing discussion and analysis, **the present Bail Application is dismissed.**

(NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025/R

BAIL APPLN. 1724/2025

Page 18 of 18