



\$~62

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 606/2026**

DHRUV BHATIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Charu Sangwan and Mr.
Shubham D., Advocates.

versus

STATE OF KARNATAKA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

10.02.2026

%

BAIL APPLN. 606/2026 & CRL.M.A. 4590/2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 482 read with section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 ('BNSS'), the petitioner seeks transit anticipatory bail in case FIR No.472/2025 dated 15.12.2025 registered under sections 314/316(2)/318(3)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS') at P.S.: HSR Layout, Bengaluru City, Karnataka.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits, that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the FIR by reason of his status as a Director of company called M/s Reinvent Agrochain Private Limited ('Reinvent').



3. It is pointed-out that the complaint is founded on a dispute raised by M/s Onionlife Private Limited ('Onionlife') arising from Platform Services Agreement dated 27.09.2024 entered-into between Onionlife and Reinvent, alleging that Reinvent has failed to make certain remittances that they had committed to do.
4. Counsel submits, that as would be seen from a perusal of complaint dated 15.12.2025, the claim of Onionlife is that a sum of about Rs. 1.39 crores is outstanding from Reinvent.
5. Counsel submits, that in the course of dealings between the parties, Reinvent has already paid about Rs. 10 crores to Onionlife, which completely dispels the allegation of criminality on the part of Reinvent and shows that the dispute is entirely of a civil nature, arising from a commercial contract.
6. Counsel submits however, that the petitioner had received a notice dated 17.12.2025 under section 35(3) of BNSS from the Investigating Officer ('I.O.') requiring his presence at P.S.: HSR Layout, Bengaluru City, Karnataka; to which the petitioner had sent an undated reply.
7. Thereafter however, the petitioner has received a second notice dated 28.01.2026 from the same I.O. under section 35(3) of BNSS, again requiring the petitioner's presence in Bengaluru, Karnataka.
8. Counsel submits, that the petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the police, despite the fact that out of the offences alleged in the FIR, only section 316(2) of the BNS is cognizable and non-bailable; and in any case, even that offence is punishable with upto 07 years of imprisonment, and therefore attracts the recent mandate of the Supreme Court that arrest should be made in such offences only when



absolutely necessary. Counsel argues, that in the present case there would be no justification for arresting the petitioner.

9. He places reliance on the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Priya Indoria vs. State of Karnataka and Ors.***¹, in particular para 96 thereof, which reads as follows :

“96. We shall now revert to our illustration given at the beginning of this judgment. In the illustration, we have stated that if a person commits an offence in one State and the FIR is lodged within the jurisdiction where the offence was committed but the accused resides in another State he can approach the court in the other State and seek transit anticipatory bail of limited duration. We have held that the accused could approach the competent court in the State where he is residing or is visiting for a legitimate purpose and seek the relief of limited transit anticipatory bail although the FIR is not filed in the territorial jurisdiction of the district or State in which the accused resides, or is present depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case. Conversely, the offence may be committed in one State, the FIR may be lodged in another State and the accused may reside in a third State. In which of the courts of the three States would the accused approach for grant of anticipatory bail? We feel that having regard to the salutary concept of access to justice, the accused can seek limited transit anticipatory bail or limited interim protection from the court in the State in which he resides but in such an event, a “regular” or full-fledged anticipatory bail could be sought from the competent court in the State in which the FIR is filed.”

10. In the circumstances, counsel seeks transit anticipatory bail for the petitioner.
11. In view of the nature of the relief sought, it is not considered necessary to issue notice to respondents Nos.1 and 2. However,

¹ (2024) 4 SCC 749



Ms.Shubhi Gupta, learned APP appearing for the State of Delhi submits, that considering the circumstances of the case, appropriate orders may be passed by the court.

12. Upon a conspectus of the submissions made, and on perusal of the FIR, and the complaint on which it is based; as well as the two notices received from the I.O. in Bengaluru and the reply sent on behalf of the petitioner, and in light of the law enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Priya Indoria*, this court is persuaded to allow the present petition.
13. It is accordingly directed that *no coercive steps* shall be taken against the petitioner *for the next 04 weeks*, within which time the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the court of competent jurisdiction in the State of Karnataka, for such relief as the petitioner may be advised to seek, in accordance with law.
14. The petition is disposed-of in the above terms.
15. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2026/ak