



\$~2 & 3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3659/2024 & CRL.M.A. 30502/2024**

YUGAL KISHOR @ CHUJJI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Pipaniya and Mr.
Gopesh Jindal, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with IO/SI Manju.

Mr. Amit Bidhuri, Advocate
for prosecutrix (*through video
conferencing*)

Prosecutrix in person.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4122/2024 & CRL.M.A. 33959/2024**

VIKAS YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Pipaniya and Mr.
Gopesh Jindal, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with IO/SI Manju.

Mr. Amit Bidhuri, Advocate
for prosecutrix (*through video
conferencing*)

Prosecutrix in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

19.08.2025

%

1. The accused/applicants seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No.470/2024 of PS Sagarpur for offence under Section 376D/377/323/506/120B/34 IPC. In furtherance of circumstances described in order dated



09.10.2024 and 06.11.2024 in the case of accused Yugal Kishore, arguments from both sides were heard.

2. Learned counsel for prosecutrix contended that during pendency of the present Anticipatory Bail applications, FIR No.575/2024 was registered by PS Sagarpur on the statement of the prosecutrix alleging that she was threatened by persons sent by the accused Vikas Yadav. Learned counsel for accused/applicant contended that even subsequent to FIR No. 575/2024, one more FIR of similar nature, alleging gang rape was registered by the sister of the prosecutrix at PS Patodi. It is further contended by learned counsel for accused/applicant that one SI Vikas Yadav of Special Cell, Delhi Police is managing all these cases to involve the accused/applicants. In this regard, learned prosecutor on instructions of the Investigating Officer/SI Manju stated that in FIR No.575/2024, the prosecutrix retracted her allegations, so untraced report is being filed. But this is denied by prosecutrix present in court.

3. Further, learned counsel for accused/applicants also claims parity with co-accused Gaurav Yadav, against whom chargesheet was filed without arresting him.

4. In the above situation, after some discussion, both sides submitted that the Investigating Officer shall continue her investigations and whenever the Investigating Officer finds sufficient material to arrest the accused/applicants, she would give them notice of one week so that they may approach this court for appropriate relief. Going by this statement of the Investigating Officer that she would give them advance notice of one week before arresting them, learned counsel for accused/applicants seeks permission to withdraw both these anticipatory bail applications. However,



the accused/applicants shall join investigation as and when directed in writing by the Investigating Officer.

5. Accordingly, both these anticipatory bail applications and pending applications are dismissed as withdrawn.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

AUGUST 19, 2025/ry