



\$~146

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1908/2026**

PUNEET KAKKER ALIAS PUNEET KAKKARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra, Mr. Rehar Saifi,
Mr. M. Vats, Mr. Amardeep Singh,
Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Mr. Yash Singh
Arora, Mr. Kesar Sangwan, Mr.
Mannat Kaur Arora, Mr. Naman Dass
Nanda, Mr. Indeeep Singh Arora, Mr.
Jaspinder Kaur Arora, Mr. Raj Gaurav
and Mr. Ravinder Tokas, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Shubhi Gupta, APP for the State.
SI Ravindra Singh, P.S.: GK-1.
Ms. Nandadevi Deka, Mr. Shaswat
Pratyush and Ms. Shubhra Sharma,
Advocates for the complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

14.05.2026

%

CRL.M.A. 15472/2026 & CRL.M.A. 15473/2026 (exemptions)

Exemptions granted, subject to just exceptions.

The applications stand disposed-of.

BAIL APPLN. 1908/2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioner seeks transit anticipatory bail in case FIR No.42/2026 dated 01.05.2026 registered under sections 69/88/77 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS') at P.S.: Mandrem, Goa.



2. Mr. Gobind Malhotra, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits, that the subject FIR was registered on 01.05.2026 based on a complaint of the same date made by the complainant/prosecutrix.
3. Counsel submits however, that before filing the said complaint, the prosecutrix had issued to the petitioner a lawyer's notice 23.04.2026, a copy of which has been appended to the petition.
4. Counsel points-out, that as would be seen from a perusal of the said notice, the essence of the allegation against the petitioner is, that based on a 'promise to marry', he made physical relations with the prosecutrix after they had met on a matrimonial website.
5. Counsel submits, that the notice would also show that the petitioner and the prosecutrix had been in a relationship from November 2024 till April 2026, during which period on the prosecutrix's own reckoning, the parties engaged in physical relations on multiple occasions, in various locations, as a result of which the prosecutrix also got pregnant.
6. It is pointed-out that the notice also recites that though the prosecutrix had to undergo abortion, the petitioner formally proposed marriage to her during her recovery phase up until April 2026, whereafter, according to the prosecutrix, the petitioner refused to proceed with the marriage citing his mother's disapproval.
7. It is argued, that in the said notice the prosecutrix had demanded from the petitioner an unconditional apology along with reimbursement of her medical bills, as well as compensation of Rs.35 lacs for mental agony, physical pain, and potential permanent impact on her reproductive health.



8. However, it is submitted that even without awaiting the petitioner's response within the 15-day period given in the said notice, it would appear on an afterthought, the prosecutrix lodged the subject FIR.
9. In the circumstances, counsel submits, that the petitioner would wish to appear before the concerned court in Goa to seek appropriate relief; but in the meantime, the petitioner be granted transit anticipatory bail on the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Priya Indoria vs. State of Karnataka & Ors.***¹
10. Attention in this behalf is drawn to the operative part of *Priya Indoria*, which is extracted below:

“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.

¹ (2024) 4 SCC 749



* * * * *

“98. Having regard to the vastness of our country and the length and breadth of it and bearing in mind the complex nature of life of the citizens, if an offence has been committed by a person in a particular State and if the FIR is filed in another State and the accused is a resident in a third State, bearing in mind access to justice, the accused who is residing in the third State or who is present there for a legitimate purpose should be enabled to seek the relief of limited anticipatory bail of transitory nature in the third State.”

(emphasis supplied)

11. Ms. Shubhi Gupta, learned APP appears for the State of Delhi on advance copy; and submits that since the Delhi Police have no jurisdiction or role in the matter, they would leave it to the court to pass appropriate orders.
12. Ms. Nandadevi Deka, learned counsel is also present on behalf of the complainant/prosecutrix and opposes the grant of anticipatory bail, submitting that the petitioner has not been ‘co-operating’ in the investigation and has been absconding since 11.05.2026; and that therefore, he does not deserve any interim protective order from this court.
13. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as learned counsel for the prosecutrix, and in view of the stand taken by the learned APP appearing for respondent No.1/State of NCT of Delhi, this court is persuaded to grant the prayer made in the petition. Also, considering the contours of the present case, this court does not deem it necessary to issue notice or to await hearing of respondent No.2/State of Goa.
14. It is observed that in *Priya Indoria*, the Supreme Court has held that if a person is alleged to have committed an offence in a State other than



where the person resides, they can approach the court in the State where they reside to seek transit anticipatory bail of a limited duration.

15. The essence of the judgment in *Priya Indoria* is, that in an appropriate case, the court may protect a person from arrest for a limited duration to enable the person to approach the court in a different State for appropriate relief in relation to the offences alleged against them.
16. It is noticed that this court has itself also granted such relief *vidé* order dated 04.03.2025 passed in BAIL APPLN. 922/2025 titled *Krishna Sethi vs. State of NCT Delhi & Anr.*
17. Upon a conspectus of circumstances obtaining in the matter, 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 concerned court of competent jurisdiction within the State of Goa, for such relief as the petitioner may be advised to seek, in accordance with law.
18. The petition is disposed-of in the above terms.
19. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.
20. Let a copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MAY 14, 2026/ak