



\$~51

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1501/2024**

AMIT PAWAR

..... Applicant

Through: Mr.R.P. Pandey, Mr.Prince
Singhal and Mr.M.F. Zaidi,
Advs.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Aman Usman, APP with SI
Nisha Sharma
Mr.Abhishek Rai and
Mr.Shahrukh Khan, Advs. for
Complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER

%

01.05.2024

CRL.M.A. 13139/2024 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 1501/2024 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 727/2024

2. This application has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short, 'Cr.P.C.') praying for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant in FIR No. 158/2024 registered at Police Station: Govind Puri, Delhi under Sections 376D/365/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short, 'IPC').

3. The above FIR has been registered on a complaint made by the victim stating that the applicant along with his friends forcibly made



the victim marry the applicant on the threat of releasing some objectionable video of her mother. He then took her to Agra, later to a guest house in Sarai Kale Khan, and lastly to a house at Meethapur. There they are alleged to have gang raped the victim on the threat of making the objectionable video of her mother viral.

4. The victim was recovered on 21.02.2024. Her statement under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. was recorded on 13.03.2024, where she has reiterated the above allegations.

5. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the victim came with the applicant of her own free will; they were married; and, thereafter, were living together happily. The parents of the victim along with Police forcefully took her away as they were against this marriage. He submits that the allegations against the applicant are false and concocted.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP submits that the allegations of the victim are consistent and require investigation. He submits that preliminary investigation has revealed that two other boys were also travelling along with the applicant and the victim. He submits that this also corroborates the statement of the victim.

7. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

8. The allegations against the applicant are rather grave and would require a thorough investigation. In my view, therefore, the applicant has not been able to make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. The learned Additional Sessions Judge also, for the above reason, has rightly rejected his application by the Order dated 09.04.2024 passed



in Bail Matters 678/2024.

9. Accordingly, the bail application is dismissed. The pending application also stands disposed of as infructuous.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MAY 1, 2024/ns

Click here to check corrigendum, if any