



\$~2 & 3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 3741/2024**

ANSHIKA VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil Devlal, Ms. Neetu Badolia,
Ms. Rita and Mr. Rajesh Kumar,
Advocates.

versus

STATE THROUGH SHO PS RANHOLA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP for State.
SI Paramjeet, P.S. Ranhola.
Mr. K.B. Shankar and Mr. Chandan
Kumar, Advocates for complainant.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4016/2024 & CRL.M.A. 33105/2024**

DEEPIKA VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil Devlal, Ms. Neetu Badolia,
Ms. Rita and Mr. Rajesh Kumar,
Advocates.

versus

STATE THROUGH SHO PS RANHOLA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP for State.
SI Paramjeet, P.S. Ranhola.
Mr. K.B. Shankar and Mr. Chandan
Kumar, Advocates for complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

21.07.2025

%

1. Through the present applications filed under Section 482 of the
Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (corresponding to Section 438 of

¹ "BNSS"



the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²), the Applicants seek pre-arrest bail in relation to FIR No. 629/2024 dated 23rd August, 2024, registered under Sections 80(2), 85 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023³ at P.S. Ranhola, Delhi.

2. The Applicant, Anshika Verma, is the sister-in-law of the deceased, while the Applicant, Deepika Verma, is the mother-in-law of the deceased. Having regard to the allegations made in the FIR, this Court, *vide* order dated 16th October, 2024, granted interim protection to Anshika Verma, and similarly, *vide* order dated 31st January, 2025, interim protection was granted to Deepika Verma. Both Applicants were, however, directed to join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer⁴.

3. In compliance with the Court's directions, the Applicants have duly appeared before the IO, and the investigation is now nearing completion. A chargesheet under Section 173 of CrPC has already been filed. Additionally, a supplementary chargesheet is in the process of being filed, pending receipt of the FSL report concerning WhatsApp messages exchanged between the deceased and her brother. Nonetheless, the presence of the Applicants is no longer required for any further investigative purposes.

4. The matter is currently at the stage of pre-arrest bail. The Court also notes that the main accused, i.e., the husband of the deceased, has already been granted regular bail. Given the fact that the Applicants have fully cooperated with the investigation, and that the investigation itself is nearing completion, their further presence for custodial interrogation is not necessary. It is well established through a catena of judgments by the

² "CrPC"

³ "BNS"



Supreme Court that the object of granting bail is neither punitive nor preventative. The primary aim sought to be achieved by bail is to secure the attendance of the accused person at the trial.⁵

5. In view of the foregoing, the applications are, therefore, allowed. The Applicants, in the event of arrest, are directed to be released on bail on furnishing a bail bond for a sum of INR 25,000/- with one surety of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of the concerned SHO, on the following conditions:

- a. The Applicants shall join and cooperate with the investigation as and when directed by the IO;
- b. The Applicants shall not leave the boundaries of the country without informing the IO/ SHO concerned;
- c. The Applicants shall not contact the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner;
- d. The Applicants shall give his mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switched on at all times;
- e. In the event of there being any FIR/DD entry / complaint lodged against the Applicants, it would be open to the State to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

6. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are for the purpose of deciding the present bail applications and should not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

⁴ “IO”

⁵ See also: *Sanjay Chandra v. CBI*, (2012) 1 SCC 40; *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 SCC 51.



7. Accordingly, the applications are disposed of along with any pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JULY 21, 2025/as