



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4325/2025 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 2268/2025**

VIKRAM NONIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Sharma, Ms. Avantika
Sharma, Mr. Shiva Vashisht and Mr.
Lokesh Sharma, Advocates

versus

STATE 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

%

18.11.2025

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No. 500/2025, registered at Police Station Bawana, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 85/316/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS').

2. Briefly stated, facts of the present case are that the complainant, Ms. Nandani Kumari, had been married to Mr. Pritam Nonia on 15.12.2024, after which she had shifted to her matrimonial home where she had allegedly been subjected to continued mental and physical harassment for dowry by her husband and his family members. It had been alleged that during the wedding ceremonies the in-laws had raised objections regarding



dowry articles and had humiliated her family. Soon thereafter, the complainant had alleged that her husband, parents-in-law, and the present applicant/accused Vikram Nonia (brother-in-law)—had persistently demanded ₹20 lakhs and additional gold articles and had subjected her to verbal abuse and daily harassment. She had further alleged that her jewellery had been taken away under the pretext of safe custody, that inappropriate remarks had been made, and that she had been compelled to follow humiliating instructions within the household. According to the complainant, despite informing her husband of these acts, he had failed to support her. The complainant had further stated that upon discovering her pregnancy, the accused persons, acting together, had allegedly forced her to consume medicines with the intention of terminating the pregnancy and had taken her to a clinic on 09.03.2025 where she had been subjected to an abortion against her will. She had also levelled allegations of sexual assault by her father-in-law and another brother-in-law and had stated that her husband had misused her social media accounts to fabricate conversations and defame her. She had additionally alleged that her husband had neglected her, had maintained an extra-marital affair, and had subjected her to mental cruelty. After enduring repeated harassment, she had left the matrimonial home on 11.03.2025. When she, along with her parents, had attempted to visit the matrimonial home to resolve the matter, the family members—including the present applicant—had allegedly refused entry and assaulted her publicly, causing her to lose consciousness. A complaint had thereafter been filed at the Women Cell, Dhanbad, leading to a mediated settlement under which her husband had agreed to take her back on 15.04.2025 and to return her belongings. However, despite signing the settlement, the husband



had not complied with any of the terms and had failed to take her back or communicate with her, which had led to filing of the present complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the allegations levelled against the present applicant, Vikram Nonia, are vague and general in nature, and no specific or concrete role has been attributed to him in the FIR. It is submitted that the FIR does not mention any particular date, time, or specific incident involving the present applicant and that the allegations have been made in a sweeping and omnibus manner against all family members without any clear distinction of individual acts. It is further contended that such vague and non-specific allegations, bereft of particulars, cannot justify the continued implication of the present applicant in the case.

4. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that the present applicant has not cooperated with the investigation, despite service of notice under Section 35(3) of the BNSS, 2023, and that non-bailable warrants have already been issued against him owing to his non-appearance. It is contended that there exists a reasonable apprehension that the applicant may tamper with the evidence or influence the complainant and other material witnesses, thereby obstructing the fair course of investigation. It is therefore submitted that no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail and that the present application deserves to be dismissed.

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

6. This Court notes that the FIR contains clear, categorical, and specific allegations against the present applicant, who is the brother-in-law of the



complainant. The complainant has stated in unambiguous terms that *“My brother-in-law has repeatedly touched me inappropriately on several occasions, despite my discomfort and clear signs of objection. His behaviour was indecent, unwanted and deeply disturbing.”*

7. Further, the attention of this Court was drawn to the complainant’s statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., wherein she has again levelled detailed and specific allegations against the applicant, alleging inappropriate physical contact, misbehaviour, and conduct amounting to sexual harassment.

8. This Court also takes note of the conduct of the applicant during the investigation. Despite service of notice under Section 35(3) of the BNSS, 2023, the present applicant did not join the investigation. It is not the case of the applicant that the notice was not served or that he was prevented by any sufficient cause from complying with it. On the contrary, it is brought to the notice of this Court that other co-accused persons have joined the investigation, whereas the applicant alone has abstained from cooperating. Such conduct of the applicant, particularly in a case involving allegations of sexual misconduct and dowry-related cruelty, gives rise to a reasonable apprehension on the part of the prosecution that he may evade the investigative process or attempt to influence witnesses.

9. Having regard to the nature and seriousness of the allegations, the applicant’s failure to join investigation despite service of notice, and the issuance of NBWs against him, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant has failed to make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Granting such relief at this stage, when the investigation is still underway and the applicant has not cooperated, would not be justified and may



prejudice the fair and effective investigation of the matter.

10. Accordingly, the present application alongwith pending application, if any, is dismissed.

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

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

NOVEMBER 18, 2025/ns

TS