



\$~67

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 193/2026**

RISHABH SEHGAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Singh and Mr. Indra Lal
and Mr. J.P. Singh, Advocates

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
the State with Ms. Amisha Dahiya,
Advocate, SI Suresh Kumar Meena,
P.S. New Usmanpur and SI Gunjan

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

19.01.2026

%

CRL.M.A. 1661/2026 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 193/2026

3. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 548/2025, registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, Delhi, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 64(1)/127(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS').

4. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.



5. Briefly stated, the allegations in the present case are that on the night of 16.10.2025, at about 10:30 PM, the complainant had attended a Diwali house party at a premises situated in Subhash Nagar, Delhi, along with her close friend Amandeep Singh Kohli. The party was hosted by the accused, Rishi Sehgal, on the rooftop of the said premises and was attended by around 15–20 persons. During the party, the complainant consumed drinks. It is alleged that at around 3:30 AM, when the complainant felt extremely sleepy, she was made to lie down in a room by her friend Amandeep and his friend Pulkit, who thereafter left the room. After some time, the complainant felt someone on top of her and, upon opening her eyes, found the present accused lying on her and sexually assaulting her. Upon resistance, the accused allegedly moved away, ran out of the room, and locked her inside. The complainant thereafter informed her friend, who opened the door, and when an attempt was made to contact the accused, he had already fled from the spot. A PCR call was immediately made, pursuant to which the complainant was taken for medical examination. As she was under the effect of medication, her statement could not be recorded at that stage. The crime scene was inspected by the crime team and relevant exhibits were collected and sealed. Subsequently, after the complainant was found fit, her statement was recorded, on the basis of which the present FIR came to be registered.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the earlier bail application i.e. BAIL APPLN. 4893/2025 filed before this Court was inadvertently withdrawn on the last date of hearing and, therefore, the present bail application has been preferred. It is contended that the applicant has been falsely implicated and that the complaint has been lodged in collusion with the complainant's friend, Amandeep Kohli, with a *mala fide*



intent to harass the applicant. It is further argued that a video allegedly recorded by Amandeep Kohli is being misused to create a false impression regarding the alleged incident. According to the learned counsel, the complainant and her associate have been demanding a sum of ₹30 lakhs to settle the matter and withdraw the case, and calls of extortion have been made in this regard. It is also submitted that the complainant had voluntarily attended the party and consumed alcohol, and the allegations levelled against the applicant are fabricated and motivated. The learned counsel emphasizes that the applicant is about 35 years of age, has clean antecedents, and undertakes to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by the Court, in the event anticipatory bail is granted.

7. The learned APP for the State, opposing the bail application, argues that the applicant has been extending threatening calls to the complainant and witnesses with a view to pressurise them to settle the matter. It is argued that the investigation has revealed the existence of a video clip in which the applicant is seen admitting to the commission of the offence. It is pointed out that the applicant has made several calls to the complainant's friend, Amandeep Kohli, for settlement, and call records in this regard form part of the status report filed before the Sessions Court. With respect to the plea of extortion raised by the applicant, it is contended that one CCTV footage relied upon by the accused was examined by the I.O. and was found to be unclear and inaudible, with no demand of money discernible therefrom. It is also submitted that there is nothing on record to show any connivance between the complainant and the witness, and there is no evidence to show that the complainant ever approached any person known to the applicant for



settlement. The learned APP also points out that Look Out Circular proceedings have already been initiated against the applicant. It is therefore prayed that the present application be dismissed.

8. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant and the State, and has perused the material on record.

9. The allegations in the present case are that the applicant, during a Diwali party, had committed rape upon the complainant inside a room while she was intoxicated.

10. The principal defence taken on behalf of the applicant is that he has been falsely implicated and that the case is a result of an alleged demand of ₹30 lakhs made by the complainant and Amandeep Kohli. However, this Court is of the opinion that *at this stage*, this contention does not find support from the material placed on record. The CCTV/video footage relied upon by the applicant was duly verified by the I.O. pursuant to directions of the Sessions Court, and it has been found that the recordings were largely unclear and inaudible, and at no point did they disclose any demand of money. The investigation has also failed to establish any attempt on the part of the complainant or any other witness to extort or solicit any monetary settlement from the applicant or his relatives.

11. On the other hand, the status report placed before the Sessions Court *prima facie* indicates that the applicant himself, as well as persons acting on his behalf, had made repeated calls to the witness Amandeep Kohli for settlement of the matter. There are specific allegations that threats were extended to the complainant and the witness to withdraw the FIR, including threats of false implication.



12. This Court also notes that electronic evidence such as mobile phones, WhatsApp chats, call records, and other digital material is yet to be recovered from the applicant. The I.O. has specifically pointed out the need for custodial interrogation for effective recovery of such evidence. Further, the conduct of the applicant during investigation, including evasion prior to grant of interim protection by the Sessions Court and the initiation of LoC proceedings, cannot be ignored while considering the present prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.

13. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the initial stage of investigation, the likelihood of tampering with evidence and influencing witnesses, and the need for custodial interrogation, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant has failed to make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

14. The bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

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

16. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JANUARY 19, 2026/ns

TD