



\$~70 & 71

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

**(70) BAIL APPLN. 1652/2024**

**(71)+ BAIL APPLN. 1653/2024**

**CHAKSHU VADHERA**

..... Applicant

**BHAGAT SINGH**

..... Applicant

Through: Mr.Rohit Yadav, Mr.Vikas  
Nain, Mr.Ashish Vyas,  
Mr.Neeraj Yadav, Mr.Deepak  
Swami, Ms.Kaveri Chauhan,  
Mr.Ravinder Chauhan,  
Mr.Vivek Yadav, Mr.Deepak  
Sharma, Mr.Navneet Yadav and  
Mr.Rahul Yadav, Advs.

versus

**STATE OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SHO PS  
GOVINDPURI & ORS.**

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Priyanka Dalal, APP with  
SI Nisha Sharma  
Mr.Abhishek Rai, Adv. for R-2  
(through VC)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**ORDER**

%

**09.05.2024**

**CRL.M.A. 14345/2024 (Exemption) in BAIL APPLN. 1652/2024**

**CRL.M.A. 14363/2024 (Exemption) in BAIL APPLN. 1653/2024**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**BAIL APPLN. 1652/2024 & CRL.M.A. 14346/2024**

**BAIL APPLN. 1653/2024 & CRL.M.A. 14364/2024**

2. These applications have been filed under Section 438 read with



Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short, 'Cr.P.C.') praying for grant of Anticipatory Bail in FIR No. 0158/2024 registered at Police Station: Govind Puri 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 co-accused, that is, Amit Pawar, along with his friends, that are, the applicants herein, forcibly made the victim marry the co-accused on the threat of releasing some objectionable video of her mother. They then took her to Agra, later to a guest house in Sarai Kale Khan, and lastly to a house at Meethapur, and at the said places, 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, wherein she has reiterated the above allegations.

5. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that the victim had come with them out of her own free will and volition. She had married Amit Pawar on 17.11.2023, and the said marriage was duly registered before the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hauz Khas on 20.11.2023. He submits that as per the customs of their area, the friends of the boy accompany the new couple and help them in the marriage, and it is only for this reason, the applicants were accompanying the victim and co-accused Amit Pawar, at the places where the victim has alleged that she was taken to forcefully by the applicants and co-accused, Amit Pawar. He has also drawn my attention to an alleged transcript of a conversation between the victim



and the wife of the Bhagat Singh (applicant in BAIL APPLN. 1653/2024) to contend that it shows that the victim had accompanied the applicants and the co-accused out of her free will and volition.

6. He further submits that, on the victim returning back to her home, the mother of the victim had herself reported to the police about her return and also stated that she had gone with the co-accused, Amit Pawar, out of her own free will and had married him. She further stated that she does not wish to pursue her complaint regarding the victim being missing.

7. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicants.

8. A similar application seeking Anticipatory Bail of the co-accused Amit Pawar, being BAIL APPLN 1501/2024, was dismissed by this Court vide an Order dated 01.05.2024. The investigation into the allegations of the victim is at the initial stage. They are rather grave and would require a proper investigation. Suffice it to say, the applicants would also have to satisfy the police as to why they were accompanying the alleged newly married couple at various places which, the learned APP submits, is substantiated with the CDRs of their mobile phones.

9. It is also relevant to note that the co-accused Amit Pawar, who married the victim was aged about 40 years, while the victim was aged only about 18½ years, at the time of her going missing. There was, therefore, a huge age difference between the co-accused and the victim. While this may not be very relevant when seen in isolation, it gains prominence in the facts of the present case.



10. In view of the above, the applicants have not been able to make out a case for grant of Anticipatory Bail. The applications are, accordingly, dismissed. The pending applications also stand disposed of being rendered infructuous.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**MAY 9, 2024/ns/am**

*[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)*