



3. Broadly speaking, allegation against the accused/applicant is that on 22.02.2019, the accused/applicant went to the police station and stated that he had killed his wife and had chopped off her body into pieces and thereafter, dumped those pieces of dead body in a septic tank. While the accused/applicant was being interrogated in the police station, a PCR call was received from brother of the deceased stating that the she had been killed and her body was recovered from the septic tank. On the basis of statement of brother of the deceased, the FIR was registered. In his complaint, brother of the deceased stated that since the deceased gave birth to three daughters, the present accused/applicant and his family members used to torture her and also used to demand dowry. Further, even on 21.09.2019, the accused/applicant called up mother of the deceased and informed her that he had murdered his wife, though the mother of the deceased did not take it seriously on that day but on next day when brother of the deceased visited house of the accused/applicant, he found blood stains and found the dead body in the septic tank.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that there are vital contradictions in the testimony of mother and brother of the deceased, but admittedly, while considering the bail application, the court shall not carry out minute analysis of the evidence on record.



2026:DHC:6957



4.1 Another contention raised by learned counsel for accused/applicant is that he never visited the police station to confess, as wrongly projected by the investigating agency. But on this aspect also, he fairly admits that in the previous bail orders, no such contention on behalf of the accused/applicant was recorded.

4.2 It is also contended on behalf of the accused/applicant that the trial is proceeding on a very slow pace, so the accused/applicant deserves bail.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for State submits that the trial is not at all slow in pace and the allegations against the accused/applicant disentitle him of bail. It is submitted that the blood-stained weapon allegedly used in chopping off the dead body of the deceased and her clothes/jewellery, etc. also were recovered and were examined forensically.

6. Of course, delay in trial is a ground for grant of bail. But that is not the only ground. While considering grant or denial of bail, the court cannot shut its eyes to the gruesome manner in which a lady was killed followed by chopping off of her body and throwing her in the septic tank.

7. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant bail to the accused/applicant. Therefore, the bail application is dismissed. Accompanying application also stands dismissed.

BAIL APPLN. 3440/2026

Page 3 of 4 pages

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, email=girish.kathpalia@nic.in, c=IN
c=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2026.08.20 18:02:58 +05'30'

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: RAHUL YADAV
Signing Date: 20.08.2026
18:04:00



2026:DHC:6957



8. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for being conveyed to the accused/applicant.

**GIRISH
KATHPALIA**

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
2.5.4.20=8401d889b27a77b265fffe4fec
45569af5962c8b4835d43597625cacca,
ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, cn=7047638,
postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,
serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5d15
37059b040f80cd2eeed0402c487965f801
e26fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2026.08.20 18:02:42 +05'30'

AUGUST 20, 2026/ry