



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3468/2025**

SURAJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Suryodaya Prakash Tiwari and
Ms. Shachi Pandey, Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
the State with Ms. Amisha Dahiya,
Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

04.11.2025

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in FIR bearing no. 500/2025, registered at Police Station Begum Pur, Delhi for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 75/351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Section 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (hereafter 'POCSO Act').
2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the present FIR was registered on the complaint of victim 'P' who alleged that the present accused had threatened her that he will disfigure her face by throwing acid. The complainant, as per prosecution's story, had befriended the accused through *Instagram*. Later, he had allegedly started threatening her that in



case she would not establish physical relations with him, he will throw acid on her and disfigure her face.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the victim and the applicant had voluntarily entered into a relationship and mutually exchanged their mobile numbers. It is argued that the applicant used to financially help the victim and the dispute between them arose as the applicant had refused to give her money. It is submitted that the mobile phone of the applicant had been destroyed by a shopkeeper to whom he had given it for repairing, due to which he could not produce the same before the Investigating Officer. It is, therefore, prayed that the applicant be released on regular bail.

4. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. It is submitted that the applicant had destroyed his mobile phone, which was crucial to retrieve the messages threatening the victim. Therefore, it is prayed that the present application for grant of regular bail be rejected.

5. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State, and has perused the material available on record.

6. This Court has also gone through the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS wherein she has supported the prosecution case and has levelled serious allegations against the present accused/applicant. The date of birth of the victim, during the course of investigation, was found to be 24.05.2010. The threat extended by the applicant to the complainant to disfigure her face by throwing acid on her in case she will not accede to his



demands, adds gravity to the offence.

7. The mobile phone of the victim has already been sent to FSL for retrieval and verification of threatening messages sent by the accused to the victim, and the FSL report is awaited. The matter is at still an initial stage, and material witnesses are yet to be examined. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, no ground for grant of regular bail is made out.

8. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed.

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

10. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

NOVEMBER 4, 2025/zp