



\$~75 & 76

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2835/2025**

GEETA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Aakash Soni, Mr Sukrit Gupta,
Mr. Annanya Giri, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
State with SI Priyanka.

(76)

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2843/2025**

BIMLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Aakash Soni, Mr Sukrit Gupta,
Mr. Annanya Giri, Advocates.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
State with SI Priyanka.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **31.07.2025**

CRL.M.A. 22089/2025 in BAIL APPLN. 2835/2025 & CRL.M.A. 22149/2025 in BAIL APPLN. 2843/2025 (exemptions)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. Applications stand disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 2835/2025 & BAIL APPLN. 2843/2025

3. By way of the present applications, the applicants are seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 0444/2025, registered at Police Station North Rohini, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 221/132/121(1)/126(2)/76/109/351(2)/3(5) of



Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Section 4 of Delhi Medicare Service Personnel and Medicare Service Institutions (Prevention of Violence and Damage to Property) Act, 2008.

4. Brief facts of the present case are that the present application has been moved in a case where the present accused persons had allegedly assaulted a doctor on duty. The FIR was registered at the behest of doctors of Baba Saheb Ambedkar Hospital, Rohini, Delhi. The complaint of the doctor mentions that on 09.06.2025, while she was returning from Ward No. 12, OPD, she was accosted and physically assaulted by 4-5 women, who had tried to strangulate her by using stethoscope which she was wearing and in that scuffle her clothes were also torn by those women. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that on 01.06.2025, patient Sonia was brought to BSA Hospital for the delivery of a child and was given admission on 02.06.2025. On the same day she had given birth to a male child. However, the child was suffering from lung infection and was shifted to the nursery. The child could not recover from the infection which had lead to his untimely demise. When the news of the demise of the child was given to the family members of the patient, they had suddenly become violent and had attacked the doctor 'X'. The CCTV footage was collected by the IO.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants states that on the ground of parity, they be granted anticipatory bails since one of the co-accused has been granted bail yesterday by this Court.

6. It is now argued by the learned APP for State that the CCTV footage reveals that a group of women had physically attacked a doctor on duty. The MLC of the doctor was prepared wherein the injuries were opined to be dangerous in nature. Therefore, the bail application be rejected.



7. The learned counsel for the applicants, however, argues that the co-accused had been granted bail and that the present accused persons have not played active role in the incident in question. It is also stated that the applicants were rather trying to save the doctor from one or two other persons who were trying to beat her, as they had protested that there was negligence in the treatment and resultantly the newborn child had passed away.

8. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, states that the doctor concerned was brutally assaulted and the CCTV footage in this regard points out the same. It is stated that there is no parity with the co-accused who had been granted bail. Since the co-accused/Meena who has been granted bail did not have any role to play in the incident and was only a bystander whereas the other co-accused has been granted regular bail. It is therefore stated that the anticipatory bail application of the applicants be rejected.

9. After hearing arguments and going through the case file, this Court had seen the opinion that the CCTV footage of the incident in question with the assistance of the IO. The same reveals that as far as accused Bimla is concerned, she was rather trying to segregate the victim and some other persons who were assaulting the victim and at no point of time in the CCTV footage, which is the only evidence available at this stage, she is seen beating the victim, or instigating others to commit the offence. In these circumstances this Court is inclined to grant her anticipatory bail subject to her joining the investigation.

10. As far as accused Geeta is concerned, the CCTV footage consistently reveals that there were one or two other ladies in front of her and the victim, and she had neither beaten the victim nor is being seen instigating the



accused persons. Therefore, this Court is inclined to grant her anticipatory bail.

11. Keeping in view all the facts and circumstances mentioned hereinabove, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to both the applicants on their furnishing personal bonds each in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/I.O concerned on the following terms and conditions:

- i) The applicants shall remain available on mobile numbers shared by him with the Police.
- ii) The applicants shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court.
- iii) The applicants shall not directly or indirectly make an attempt to influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- iv) In case of change of residential address/contact details, the applicants shall promptly inform the same to the concerned I.O/SHO.

12. Accordingly, the bail applications stand disposed of.

13. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed herein above shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JULY 31, 2025/vc