



\$~50

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 931/2026**

RAJBEER

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Sisodia, Mr. Aman
Sisodia and Mr. Anurag Sharma,
Advs.

versus

**STATE GOVT OF NCT DELHI THROUGH SHO PS CRIME
BRANCH AHTU**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **11.03.2026**

CRL.M.A. 7087/2026 (exemption)

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

BAIL APPLN. 931/2026

3. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No.148/2022, registered at Police Station Crime Branch, Delhi for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 3/4/5 of the Immoral Traffic Prevention Act, 1956.
4. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.
5. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that information was received that a human trafficking racket was being operated, wherein foreign women were allegedly trafficked through Nepal to Delhi, India and forced



into prostitution. Acting on the said information, on 22.07.2022, a police official was deputed as a decoy customer, and another police official was assigned the role of a shadow witness. The contact was established with the alleged agents through 'WhatsApp' message, while concealing the real identity of the police officials. Thereafter, the decoy customer along with the shadow witness proceeded to the premises at Panchsheel Vihar, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi, where the agents, Mohd. Arup and Chande Sahni, allegedly produced ten foreign women for prostitution. Subsequently, a raid was conducted and both the agents were apprehended at the spot. On the basis of the said incident, the present FIR was registered at the concerned Police Station.

6. It is further stated that on 28.07.2022, one of the rescued women, namely "ZK", who was among the ten women recovered during the raid, gave her statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. In her statement, the victim alleged that she had been kept in confinement at the said premises by Rajbeer (the present applicant) along with co-accused Mohd. Arup , and that she was forced into prostitution under threats to her life and the safety of her family members.

7. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case, as he has no role in the commission of the alleged offence. It is further argued that the applicant has not been named in the FIR. Further, it is stated that the applicant is ready and willing to join the investigation. It is thus prayed that the applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

8. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that the allegations against the present applicant are serious in nature and the role of



the present applicant is apparent, as has been alleged by the victim in her statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. Further, it is argued that investigation *qua* this applicant needs to be conducted deeply and which may even require custodial interrogation. It is accordingly prayed that the present application for anticipatory bail be rejected.

9. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of both the sides and has perused the material available on record.

10. After hearing the arguments and perusing the case file, this Court is of the opinion that the FIR in the present case was registered in the year 2022. However, during the intervening period of nearly four years, the prosecution agency did not seek any coercive process against the present applicant. No application was moved before the Court on the ground that the whereabouts of the present applicant were unknown, despite the fact that his name had surfaced in the statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. of one of the women apprehended on the spot.

11. The Investigating Officer, who is present in Court, has also not been able to satisfactorily explain what steps were taken or what efforts were made to apprehend the present applicant during the course of the investigation. It is further noted that the chargesheet against the co-accused persons has already been filed.

12. Keeping in view all the facts and circumstances mentioned hereinabove, this Court is *inclined to grant anticipatory bail* to the applicant, and in event of arrest, the applicant shall be released on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/I.O concerned on the following terms and conditions:



- i) The applicant shall join investigation, as and when called by the concerned IO/SHO and shall remain available on mobile numbers; shared by him with the Police.
 - ii) The applicant shall not leave country without prior permission of the concerned Court and shall also surrender his passport with the Police.
 - iii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make an attempt to influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
 - iv) In case of change of residential address/contact details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned I.O/SHO.
13. The bail application stands disposed of.
14. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed herein above shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.
15. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

**MARCH 11, 2026/A/
rb**