



\$~83

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1088/2026**

MANU BHARDWAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. P.S. Sridhar Raj, Mr. Abhishek
Pandey and Ms. Sharmila Leuka,
Advocates.

versus

NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC for the
State.
SI Anil, P.S. Sagarpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

06.04.2026

CRL.M.A. 10225/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.A. 10227/2026

By way of the present application filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the applicant/petitioner seeks permission to file electronically/digitally signed documents, including *vakalatnama*.

2. For the reasons stated in the application, which is duly supported by affidavit, the present application is allowed.
3. The application is accordingly disposed-of.

W.P.(CRL) 1088/2026 & CRL.M.A. 10226/2026 (stay)

4. By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with section 482 of the Code of Criminal



Procedure 1973 ('Cr.P.C.'), the petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 367/2023 dated 25.07.2023 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at P.S.: Sagar Pur, South West District, Delhi.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits, that the petitioner is ordinarily a resident of Warsaw, Poland and has had no engagement with respondent No.2 (complainant), who is his brother's wife.
6. Counsel submits, that apart from the generalised allegations, no specific act or omission has been attributed to the petitioner in the subject FIR. He submits, that accordingly the FIR does not disclose commission of any cognizable offence against the petitioner.
7. Issue notice.
8. Mr. Y.R. Ansari, learned ASC appears on behalf of the State on advance copy; and accepts notice.
9. Mr. Ansari draws attention to the following portion of the subject FIR, which reads as under:

“20/5/22 मेरे देवर भन्न ने मुझे से बतनीजी से बात की और दहेज को लेकर ताने मारे । मेरे देवर ने मुझे से कहा मुझे तेरे बाप के दिए हुए उपहार और कपडे पसंद नहीं आये, आगे से कुछ भी दो तो मुझे और मेरे बीबी को तो Branded कपडे व समान देना। मेरे देवर ने कपेड़ उठा कर मेरे मुँह पर फेंक दिए । मेरे ससुराल पक्ष में सभी ने सास और पति नंद नदोई को कपडे पसंद न आने पर कपडे मेरे मुँह पे फेंक दिए थे । मेरे ससुराल वालो ने दहेज के लालच में मुझे बहुत बेहज्जत किया, मानसिक पीड़ा पहुंचाही और मुझे नौकरानी बना के रखा 28/5/22 मेरे देवर मनु ने मुझे घर में अकेला पा कर पहले तो मुझे दहेज के लिए तने मारे, जब में अपने कमरे में जाने लगी तो मुझे जबरदस्ती मुझे रोका और मुझे किस किया और मेरे सीने पर अपना हाथ रखा । जब मैंने जोर से धक्का देते हुए अपने देवर पे गुस्सा किया डाटा की यह क्या बत्तमीजी है, तो मेरे देवर ने कहा इतना क्या गुस्सा कर रही है, इतना हक़ तो मेरा बनता है तेरे पर । मेरे देवर ने कहा तू भाभी है मेरी और भाभी देवर में



इतना तो चलता है। जब मैंने यह बात अपने पति और सास को बताई तो दोनों हँसने लगे और मुझसे मेरे पति और सास ने कहा इसमें कोन-सी बड़ी बात है भाभी देवर में इतना तो चलता है। मेरी सास, पति और देवर ने मुझे बहुत ही ज्यादा मांग पूरी करने के लिए परेशान किया, मानसिक पीड़ा पहुंचाई और सारे घर का काम करवाया और अपनी कूरता मुझ पर दिखाई।.....

“..... घर पर मेरी सास नन्द और देवर साथ थे। मेरी सास ने फिर दरवाजा नहीं खोला और मुझे जाने को कहा। जब मैं वहां से नहीं गई तो मेरे देवर व नन्द ने मुझे सीढ़ियों से धक्का दिया.....”

10. Mr. Ansari accordingly submits, that the FIR does contain specific allegations against the petitioner. Learned ASC informs the court, that the petitioner has not joined investigation so far.
11. Learned ASC further submits that in her statement recorded under 164 of the Cr.P.C., the complainant has reiterated the allegations in the FIR, whereupon the offence under section 354 of the IPC has also been added during investigation.
12. Mr. Ansari also submits, that requisite notice under section 41-A of the Cr.P.C. was issued to the petitioner *via* e-mail as well as by affixation. This assertion is however disputed by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.
13. Upon being queried as to the grounds on which the present petition is premised, in light of the law laid-down by the Supreme Court in *State of Haryana & Ors. Vs. Bhajan Lal & Ors.*¹, learned counsel for the petitioner submits, that the allegations against the petitioner are

¹ (1992) Supp. (1) SCC 335



general in nature and do not constitute any criminal offence as alleged.

14. Upon a conspectus of the submissions made, and upon perusal of the subject FIR, this court is of the view that certain specific allegations, with date and actions alleged, are contained in the subject FIR; and that accordingly no ground is made-out for quashing of the subject FIR.
15. The present petition is accordingly dismissed at the stage of issuance of notice itself.
16. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

APRIL 6, 2026

V.Rawat