IN THE COURT OF SHRI RAVI, JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS-07, PATIALA HOUSE COURTS NEW DELHI DISTRICT: NEW DELHI

FIR No. 108/2026
State Vs. Prabal Pratap & Chanderbhan
PS: Tilak Marg
U/s 132/221/224/351(2)/352/3(5) BNS, 2023

Sh. Ravi
Judicial Magistrate, First Class-07
06, Ground Floor, Main Buidling,
Patiala House Court,
New Delhi

27.07.2026

Present: Sh. Bhanu Pratap, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Prakash Kumar Jha and Sh. Vinod Kumar Dubey, Ld. Counsels for applicant/ accused persons.

ORDER ON BAIL APPLICATION

1. These are two applications for regular bail under Section 480 BNSS, 2023, moved on behalf of accused Prabal Pratap and accused Chanderbhan respectively, in connection with above captioned. Since both applications arise out of the same FIR, the same set of facts, and raise identical legal issues, they are being disposed of by this common order.

2. As per the complaint of HC Ravindra Kumar, Supreme Court Security, both accused had appeared as Petitioners-in-Person before Court No. 13 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 10.07.2026, in SLP (Crl.) Diary No. 31367/2026. It is alleged that during the course of hearing, accused Prabal Pratap, in a fit of anger, hurled papers in the courtroom and used unparliamentary and abusive language directed at the Hon'ble Chief Justice of India, and that on being restrained by the complainant, he pushed and used criminal force against the complainant, thereby

obstructing him in the discharge of his public duty. Accused Chanderbhan is alleged to have supported and abetted the conduct of the co-accused. Both were arrested on 11.07.2026 and have remained in custody since, presently under judicial custody.

3. Learned counsel for the accused submits that both accused are young persons students, with no prior criminal antecedents; that the incident arose out of a highly charged, unstructured emotional outburst while appearing unrepresented before the highest court of the land, and not out of any pre-meditated design; that the investigation is stated to be complete, and the police report itself records that no further involvement or recovery is pending qua either accused; that the offences alleged, other than being non-heinous in nature, are punishable with maximum sentences not exceeding two years; and that continued incarceration serves no investigative purpose.

4. The present applications has been vehemently opposed by Ld. Addl. PP appearing for the State.

5. Arguments heard *in extenso*. The record has been thoroughly perused.

6. The allegations, as they stand, disclose conduct that squarely implicates the decorum and dignity that every courtroom, and more so the courtroom of the highest constitutional court of the land, is entitled to command from those who appear before it. A litigant, howsoever aggrieved by the outcome of his cause or howsoever unrepresented, does not thereby acquire licence to hurl papers in open court or direct abusive language at the presiding authority, much less at the office of

Judicial Magistrate, First Class-07 Patiala House Court, New Delhi

the Chief Justice of India, an institution that stands as the final guarantor of the very rights and liberties that every citizen, including the accused, invokes when knocking on the doors of the judiciary. Conduct of this nature, if allowed to pass unremarked, carries the risk of being perceived as tacitly acceptable, and it is necessary to state clearly, as part of the record of these proceedings, that such conduct is not condoned and stands unequivocally deprecated. It is expected that the accused, will in future conduct themselves before this or any other court with the restraint and decorum that the administration of justice necessarily demands.

7. At the same time, it may be noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, being the institution whose dignity is stated to have been affronted, has itself dealt with the matter with considerable equanimity. The order dated 10.07.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Bench records that the petitioner, while appearing in person, made "incoherent and unparliamentary utterances," but goes on to record that the court did not propose to take any action against him, having regard to his condition. An institution of the stature and permanence of the Supreme Court of India is not diminished by the intemperate conduct of a single agitated, unrepresented litigant, and it is only appropriate that subordinate courts, in assessing the consequences that ought to flow from such conduct at the stage of bail, be guided by the same institutional restraint and equanimity that the highest court itself has demonstrated. The question of bail, therefore, has to be answered not on the basis of how grave the language used may appear on its face, but strictly on settled principles of bail jurisprudence.

8. Coming to the merits of the bail applications, this court is required to examine whether continued custody is warranted, uninfluenced by the emotive character of the allegations. The offences under Sections 132, 221, 224, 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 are triable by this court and carry maximum sentences not exceeding two years. The investigating agency's own report dated 22.07.2026 records that the investigation qua both accused stands complete, that the site has been inspected, relevant statements recorded, and medical records seized, and that no further recovery or custodial interrogation is required. No material has been placed before this court to show that either accused is required for any further investigative purpose. It is well settled that bail is the rule and jail the exception, more so in offences that do not entail grave or heinous punishment, and that pre-trial detention ought not to be employed as an instrument of punishment before conviction. Reliance placed by learned counsel on ***Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51,*** and ***Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273,*** is apposite. The gravity of the language allegedly used, however deprecable, cannot by itself convert offences that are otherwise non-heinous in nature into grounds for indefinite pre-trial incarceration, particularly once the investigation stands substantially complete. The accused have roots in society, verified rural addresses, and there is no material to suggest any real risk of their fleeing from justice, tampering with evidence, or influencing witnesses, both of whom are police/security officials unlikely to be swayed.

9. Accordingly, while recording its unequivocal disapproval of the conduct attributed to the accused persons for the reasons discussed above, and making it clear that the observations herein are confined to

the question of bail and shall have no bearing on the merits of the trial, this court is of the view that continued detention of the accused is not warranted in law.

10. In view of the foregoing discussion, both bail applications are allowed. **Accused Prabal Pratap and accused Chanderbhan are directed to be released on regular bail subject to each of them furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety of the like amount** to the satisfaction of the concerned concernec court/duty Magistrate, and subject to the following conditions:

(i) The accused shall join investigation/trial as and when required ;

(ii) The accused shall not, directly or indirectly, tamper with evidence or attempt to influence or contact the complainant or any prosecution witness;

(iii) The accused shall furnish their current mobile numbers and residential addresses to the IO and shall intimate any change forthwith;

(iv) The accused shall not commit any offence while on bail, and shall maintain strict decorum in all judicial proceedings;

(v) Any breach of the above conditions shall entitle the prosecution to seek cancellation of bail.

11. Application is disposed accordingly. Copy of the order be given dasti, if requested for.

-Sd-

(RAVI)
JMFC-07/PHC/NDD/27.07.2026

Judicial Magistrate, First Class-07
06, Ground Flor, Main Building
Patiala House Courts
New Delhi