



\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010292992026
+ **BAIL APPLN. 2590/2026**
SANDEEP KUMARPetitioner
Through: Mr. Nikhil Tyagi, Adv.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP with Insp.
Krishan Gopal

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **03.09.2026**

1. This hearing has been conducted through hybrid mode.
2. Briefly stated, deceased Preeti was residing with the applicant, Sandeep Kumar, since 04.05.2021. She died during the intervening night of 14/15.04.2022. It is alleged that the applicant cremated her at Nigam Bodh Ghat on 15.04.2022 without informing her parental family and without any medical examination or post-mortem. On the complaint of the deceased's father, **FIR No. 253/2022** was registered at Police Station Farsh Bazar, District Shahdara, Delhi under Sections 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, Delhi (hereinafter referred to as '**IPC**').
3. The applicant was arrested on 22.04.2022 and has remained in judicial custody since then. The charge-sheet has been filed and the trial is pending in **Sessions Case No. 374/2022**. His previous bail application before this Court was dismissed as withdrawn on 20.08.2025, with liberty to approach the Trial Court upon any change in circumstances. The subsequent bail application was dismissed by the learned Trial Court on 16.05.2026.



4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been in judicial custody for the last four years and that out of the 26 witnesses cited in this case, only four have been examined till date and that for no fault of the applicant, he has been in incarceration for the aforesaid time period.
5. He further submits that the applicant himself informed his family members about the death of the deceased and that the cremation was conducted at Nigam Bodh Ghat and not at an isolated place and, therefore, no inference that the applicant caused the disappearance of evidence can be drawn.
6. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant had taken the deceased to a doctor on the previous day i.e. the day before the day of incident and that the statement of the said doctor was duly recorded by the Investigating Officer (IO).
7. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State submits that the applicant caused the death of the deceased, with whom he was in a live in relationship.
8. He further submits that the applicant neither informed the family members of the deceased about her death nor did he disclose correct facts to them and, instead, falsely represented that she had left the house.
9. Learned APP for the state further submits that the applicant furnished false particulars at the cremation ground and represented that the deceased had died of a heart attack, although he had neither taken her to a doctor nor called one to the place where she died. It is submitted that, without having got conducted any medical examination, the applicant took the dead body for cremation even before informing the police.
10. Heard the learned counsels for both the parties and perused the material placed on record.



11. The material placed on record prima facie indicates that, not only did the applicant cause the death of the deceased but that he also furnished incorrect information to her relatives and misled the police, resulting in a delay in registration of the FIR.
12. Keeping in view the gravity of the offence and the allegations levelled against the present applicant, no ground for the bail is made out.
13. The present application is therefore dismissed. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.
14. The order be uploaded on the website *forthwith*.

MADHU JAIN, J

SEPTEMBER 3, 2026/JYH/PG