



\$~10

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3034/2025**

RUPAK CHATERJEE @ ARYAN VED CHATERJEE @ REHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhas Mishra, Adv. (DHCLSC)
with Ms. Neha Singhal & Ms.
Deepika Gawri Tyagi, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yudhvair Singh Chauhan, APP for
the State with WSI Shruti Saini, PS
Karol Bagh.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **09.09.2025**

CRL.M.A. 23493/2025 (exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

This application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 3034/2025

1. This is an application for the grant of interim bail for a period of 60 days filed on behalf of the petitioner in case FIR no. 416/2020 under Section 376(2)(N)/419 IPC, registered at PS Karol Bagh.
2. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is suffering from Right Inguinal Scrotal Hernia and has been advised surgery by the DDU hospital. He states that petitioner is unwilling to get himself operated from



DDU hospital as there is no robotic Laparoscopic surgery facility available at DDU hospital and therefore wants to undergo surgery from a reputed private hospital.

3. The application has been opposed by the Ld. APP submitting that there is no justification for the grant of interim bail for the purpose of surgery in the present case inasmuch as such treatment is available in government hospital.

4. The report received from the Senior Medical Officer of the Jail reveals that petitioner is diagnosed with Right Inguinal Hernia and has been advised surgery by the DDU hospital but petitioner has refused to get himself operated from DDU hospital or any other government hospital and want to get operated in a private hospital. The report further reveals that the general condition of the petitioner is stable.

5. There is no reason as to why the petitioner cannot undergo surgery from some other government hospital where laparoscopic treatment is available or even from a private hospital at his own expense while staying in custody.

6. There is no justification for the grant of interim bail. The application is, therefore, dismissed.

7. However, the petitioner is at liberty to obtain the treatment from the private hospital while staying in custody at his own expense, if so advised by the Doctor.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025/lks/na