



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 352/2026**

NARENDER SHARMA @ AKHTAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sakshi Sachdeva with Mr. Harish,
Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
State with SI Suman Yadav, PS Sarita
Vihar.
Mr. Dushyant Yadav, Mr. Suraj Singh
Chahar, Mr. Pankaj Kumar Yadav and
Mr. Akshit Chaudhary, Advocates for
respondent No.2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

%

06.05.2026

CRL.M.A. 2759/2026 (exemption)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 352/2026

1. Applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No.7/2023 dated 04.01.2023 registered at P.S. Sarita Vihar for commission of offences under Sections 376/506/509 IPC. Subsequently, charge-sheet was filed for offences under Sections 376/328/494/495/450/506/509 IPC.
2. FIR was registered on the basis of the statement of complainant (hereinafter referred to as 'Ms. D'). According to Ms. D, she came in contact

BAIL APPLN. 352/2026

1



of the accused in the year 2018 through one of her common friends and they exchanged their mobile numbers and started talking to each other. According to her, on 12.10.2018, the applicant had come to her house and raped her forcibly and also clicked her nude photographs. She was threatened not to disclose about the incident to anyone, else her photographs would be made viral. Later on, he proposed to her for marriage and, when she declined, he, again, threatened her to accept his marriage proposal. She entered into wedlock with him on 29.03.2019 at *Arya Samaj Mandir* but he never took her to her matrimonial home and kept on establishing physical relation with her several times at different hotels. Eventually, she learnt that the applicant was already married to someone else and had even two kids from such previous wife. She also learnt that he was a habitual criminal and was in judicial custody in a case of attempted murder. So much so, according to her, the applicant was threatening her by sending messages and calling her from different mobile numbers while being in custody. It was in the abovesaid backdrop that FIR was got registered against him on 04.01.2023.

3. The contention coming from the side of the applicant is two-fold.
4. Firstly, there is no explanation from the side of prosecution for lodging FIR after such an inordinate delay. She submits that the alleged sexual assault took place in the year 2018 but FIR was got registered in the year 2023. She also submits that, even otherwise, the petitioner has already undergone incarceration for around 3½ years and since the complainant has already been examined, there is no chance of his threatening or influencing her and, therefore, he deserves the concession of bail.
5. Learned Addl. P.P. for the State submits that the case is virtually at the last leg of the trial as out of 12 cited prosecution witnesses, 6 witnesses have



already been dropped, and out of remaining 6 witnesses, three witnesses have already been examined. He submits that since there are only three witnesses left, every effort would be made to expedite the trial as quickly as possible. He submits that since the applicant is involved in various other matters and had even dared to send threatening messages from jail, it will not be appropriate to release him on bail at this stage when the complainant is having apprehension that there would be harm to her life, in case he is released on bail.

6. Undoubtedly, this Court cannot keep aside the fact that incarceration period is already quite high but, at the same time, since only three witnesses are left, it will be appropriate if the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and to dispose of the case as expeditiously as possible and, preferably, within a period of four months from today.

7. In view of the above, the present application is disposed of with direction to learned Trial Court to dispose of the abovesaid case within a period of four months from today. Needless to say, if the case is not disposed of within the abovesaid time-frame, the applicant would be at liberty to file application afresh before this Court.

8. The application stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

9. A copy of this order be sent to learned Trial Court for information and necessary compliance.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 6, 2026
st/pb