



\$~5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 79/2026**

PARVEEN RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravinder Singh, Mr. Sandeep
Duhan, Ms. Raveesha Gupta and Mr.
Ritvik Bhardwaj, Advocates.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State.
SI Mohit, P.S.: Alipur.
Mr. Amit Rana, Advocate for
complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

17.02.2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 483 read with section 369(1) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 ('BNSS'), the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 600/2025 dated 08.11.2025 registered under sections 115(2)/126(2)/74/79/351(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS') at P.S.: Alipur.

2. Notice on this petition was issued on 09.01.2026.
3. Status report dated 13.02.2026 has been filed.
4. Nominal roll dated 10.02.2026 has also been received from the Jail Superintendent.
5. The complainant is also represented by counsel in the present proceedings.



6. The court has heard Mr. Ravinder Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. Shoaib Haider, learned APP for the State; as well as Mr. Amit Rana, learned counsel for the complainant.
7. Mr. Singh has sought to point-out the contradictions between the status report filed in the present proceedings, when compared with what was stated by the I.O. in the status report filed before the learned trial court, especially in relation to the presence of a truck driver on the spot at the time of the incident,
8. However, learned APP has drawn attention to the statement of the truck driver, one Inder Singh, recorded under section 180 of the BNSS on 12.02.2026, as shown to the court from the case diary. Learned APP submits that in that statement the truck driver has said that he had brought the dumper truck carrying mud to the spot, which was unloaded on the field between midnight on 04.11.2025 and about 06:30 a.m. on 05.11.2025; and that after completing that task, he had driven-off with the truck.
9. Mr. Haider also points-out, that the truck driver has clearly stated that while he was at the spot, discharging mud onto the field, no incident of as alleged in the FIR had occurred.
10. Learned APP accordingly points-out, that at the time the incident is stated to have occurred *i.e.*, at about 07:00 a.m. on 05.11.2025, there was no truck at the spot.
11. Mr. Haider has also drawn attention, to the MLR of the complainant conducted on 05.11.2025, to point-out that no external injuries were visible on her; and the only complaint was of decreased hearing in the left ear, and pain on the right side of the forehead, by reason of the



alleged physical assault. It is submitted, that neither the decreased hearing nor the pain in the forehead were discernible to the examining doctor.

12. Since the aforesaid aspects have been pointed-out by the learned APP from the case diary, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the contents of the case diary were obviously not to the petitioner's knowledge.
13. The court has also heard learned counsel for the complainant, who insists that the allegations in the FIR are correct.
14. Furthermore the petitioner's nominal roll shows that he has suffered judicial custody for more than 02 months; and that his jail conduct has been 'satisfactory'.
15. It is however pointed-out, that another FIR also stands registered against the petitioner bearing FIR No. 351/2025 dated 01.07.2025 under sections 115(2)/333/351(2)/3(5) of the BNS registered at P.S.: Alipur.
16. Be that as it may, the main consideration that prevails in court in the present case, *at this stage*, is that the statement of the truck driver recorded under section 180 of the BNSS, completely dispels the presence of a truck at the spot at the relevant time. Accordingly, the principal allegation that the petitioner alongwith co-accused persons, had sought to run-over the complainant with the truck, do not appear to have any evidentiary basis.
17. In view thereof, this court is inclined to allow the present petition.



18. The petitioner – ***Parveen Rana s/o Surender Singh*** – is accordingly admitted to *regular bail* pending trial, subject to the following conditions:
- 18.1. The petitioner shall furnish a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rs. Twenty-five Thousand Only) with 01 surety in the like amount from a family member, to the satisfaction of the learned trial court;
- 18.2. The petitioner shall furnish to the Investigating Officer/S.H.O a cellphone number on which the petitioner may be contacted at any time and shall ensure that the number is kept active and switched-on at all times;
- 18.3. If the petitioner has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the learned trial court and shall not travel out of the country without prior permission of the learned trial court;
- 18.4. The petitioner shall not contact, nor visit, nor offer any inducement, threat or promise to any of the prosecution witnesses or other persons acquainted with the facts of case. The petitioner shall not tamper with evidence nor otherwise indulge in any act or omission that is unlawful or that would prejudice the proceedings in the pending trial; and
- 18.5. In case of any change in his residential address/contact details, the petitioner shall promptly inform the I.O. in writing.
19. Since the petitioner is facing trial and would therefore be appearing before the learned trial court from time-to-time, it is not considered necessary to impose a reporting requirement as a condition of regular bail.



20. The petition stands disposed-of in the above terms.
21. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2026/hb