



\$~65

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1398/2026, CRL.M.A. 5620/2026

S S

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nagender Kr. Yadav and Ms.
Nikita Jaiswal, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the
State.

SI Vikas Singh, P.S.: Prashant Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

19.02.2026

CRL.M.A. 5621/2026

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 1398/2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 read with section 483(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioner seeks a direction '*to cancel the bail of the Respondent No. 02 as granted in Bail Appln. 4322/2023 on 04.03.2025 in FIR No. 457/2023, PS Prashant Vihar, (Rohini), Delhi*'.

2. Mr. Nagender Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits, that respondent No.2 (petitioner's brother-in-law) has violated the conditions of anticipatory bail granted to her by this court.
3. Issue notice.
4. Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned APP is present on behalf of the State on advance copy.



5. Upon query, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that their allegation of violation of the bail conditions is premised on the basis that respondent No.2 has not complied with the obligations on her part under the mediated Settlement Agreement dated 11.11.2024.
6. It is noticed however, that by order dated 04.03.2025 made in Bail Appln. No.4322/2023, this court had granted anticipatory bail to respondent No.2, on certain conditions as contained in para 8 thereof; but the obligations, if any, on the part of respondent No.2 contained in mediated Settlement Agreement dated 11.11.2024 were *not* part of the conditions for grant of anticipatory bail.
7. Besides, learned APP informs the court that the Investigating Officer has never had the occasion to arrest respondent No.2; and therefore order dated 04.03.2025 has never been availed by respondent No.2.
8. Clearly, if order dated 04.03.2025 has never been availed since respondent No.2 has never been arrested, the question of respondent No.2 being bound by the conditions contained in that order does not arise.
9. There is evidently no merit in the present petition.
10. The petition is accordingly dismissed at the stage of issuance of notice itself.
11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

FEBRUARY 19, 2026/ak