



\$~73

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1323/2026**

VICKY @ VIKKY

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Medhavi Tyagi, Mr. Utsav Kumar, Mr. Devender Kumar and Mr. Bikram Vishal Kumar, Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Satish Kumar, APP for the State with Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh, Advocate alongwith SI Pradeep Kumar, P.S. Aman Vihar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

06.04.2026

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), the applicant seeks regular bail in FIR No.381/2023 dated 29.07.2023, PS: Aman Vihar, Delhi registered under *Sections 363/368/328/376/34* of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**) and *Sections 6/21* of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO).
2. Learned counsel for the applicant has addressed her arguments on merits when, primarily, she has relied upon the reply filed by the prosecution before the learned Trial Court and submits that the same are sufficient for this Court to grant regular bail to the applicant.
3. However, this Court is not convinced with her arguments on merits,



as also particularly since the said reply before the learned Trial Court can also not come to the aid of the applicant since the assertions made, grounds raised in the present application as also the arguments addressed thereon are without any change of circumstances. In fact, learned counsel for the applicant has been unable to demonstrate anything which could show that there existed any change in circumstances post the dismissal of the applicant's last bail application by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 11.03.2026. Moreover, vide order dated 03.12.2025 filed alongwith the present application reflects that the applicant had earlier also filed an application seeking regular bail before this Court by way of BAIL APPLN. 4484/2025, which was though dismissed as withdrawn, but with the following observations:-

“2. Let the trial be concluded expeditiously, preferably within a period of six months. In case the trial is not concluded within the stipulated time, the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court at the appropriate stage...”

4. For the above reasons, as also since the applicant has approached this Court by way of the present application on the very same facts and circumstances, as also since it is admitted case that the aforesaid period of *six months* has not elapsed yet, there is no reason to proceed for hearing the present application.

5. Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

APRIL 6, 2026/dy