



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4461/2024**

**SATPAL**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sonali Harish and Mr. Brajesh  
Dwivedi, Advocates.

versus

**STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for the  
State.  
SI Rakesh Kumar, Dwarka.  
Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Amicus for  
complainant.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN**

**ORDER**

**15.01.2025**

%

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 CrPC and Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 seeking regular bail in connection with FIR No. 0473/2023 registered at P.S. Dabri.
2. The case of the prosecution in brief is that in March 2019, on one day at about 01.30 P.M. when victim went to play on the second floor of his maternal house, the petitioner herein i.e. Satpal (tenant) threatened him by showing a knife and sexually assaulted (oral) the victim. However, the victim informed his father/complainant about the incident after a period of four years in 2023, where after the complainant got the present FIR registered at PS Dabri.



3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the incident is of March 2019 and the FIR came to be registered only on 12.07.2023, therefore, there is delay of four years in the registration of FIR, which itself shows that the allegations are fabricated and false case has been foisted upon the petitioner.

4. The learned APP appearing on behalf of the State submits that the delay is for the reason that earlier the victim had shared the incident with his maternal grandmother and they did not divulge the same to the father of the victim. Later after four years when the victim himself told his father about the incident, the FIR came to be registered at his instance. He also apprises the court that the entire prosecution evidence has been concluded in one years' time and that now the matter is listed for recording the statement of accused under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. on 28.01.2024.

5. He also urges the court since the custody period of the petitioner is only 18 months and there is no delay in the trial and further the trial is likely to be concluded very soon, therefore, instead of allowing the bail application, a direction may be given to the learned Trial Court for expeditious disposal.

6. In view of the above, considering the nature of offence alleged, the custody period of the petitioner and further regard being had to the fact that the trial is proceeding at a fast pace, the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the recording of statement of the accused on the next date and to conclude the trial preferably within a period of two months.

7. However, the petitioner is granted liberty to approach this Court with a fresh application, in the event the trial is not concluded in two months' time.



8. With the aforesaid directions, the bail application is disposed of.

**VIKAS MAHAJAN, J**

**JANUARY 15, 2025/NG**