



\$~62

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2128/2026**

RITHIK @ RITIK

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kaushal Thakur & Mr. Rahul
Thakur, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.
PSI Ritika, P.S.: Vijay Vihar.
Prosecutrix in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **29.05.2026**

CRL.M.A. 17495/2026

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 2128/2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 ('BNSS'), the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.0216/2026 dated 03.05.2026 registered under section 70(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at P.S.: Vijay Vihar, Rohini, Delhi.

2. Mr. Kaushal Thakur, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits, that a perusal of the subject FIR as well as the prosecutrix's statement recorded under section 183 of the BNSS would show, that the prosecutrix has made no allegation against the petitioner in relation to the alleged offence.



3. It is submitted, that the prosecutrix and the petitioner are friends, and as the narration in the subject FIR and the statement recorded under section 183 of the BNSS show, though they were together in the hotel room on the date of incident, the prosecutrix has categorically said that the petitioner had fallen asleep in a state of intoxication and did nothing wrong to her.
4. In the circumstances, it is argued that no offence is made-out against the petitioner; yet he has been in judicial custody since 04.05.2026.
5. Issue notice.
6. Mr. Shoaib Haider, learned APP appears for the State on advance copy; accepts notice.
7. The prosecutrix is present in-person; and also accepts notice.
8. Learned APP submits, that the petitioner's name has been mentioned in the subject FIR, since it is he who had taken the prosecutrix to the hotel room; and that therefore, it is he who facilitated access of the prosecutrix to the main accused, Pankaj.
9. The court has also heard the prosecutrix who is present in-person. She categorically states that she has made no allegation against the petitioner; and that she had stated the same to the doctors who conducted her MLC, as well as in her statement recorded before the learned Magistrate under section 183 of the BNSS.
10. The court has also perused the police file.
11. The prosecutrix's statement under section 183 of the BNSS *clearly* records that according to her, Ritik had done no wrong, and that she wanted to take the complaint back.



12. It is further noticed, that in the narration given by the prosecutrix to the doctors who conducted the MLC, she has again said that she had gone out for dinner with the petitioner, after which they “*planned for alcohol party*”. She further says, that thereafter both of them went to a hotel room and had alcohol till late, whereafter “*Ritik slept off*”. The allegation is that after that two of Ritik’s friends came into the room and committed the offence upon her.
13. There also appears to be no medical evidence against the petitioner.
14. Upon a pointed query, the prosecutrix has said that she *does not* oppose the grant of bail to the petitioner.
15. In the circumstances obtaining in the matter, this court is persuaded to allow the present petition at this stage itself.
16. Accordingly, the petitioner – ***Rithik @ Ritik s/o Harpal Singh*** – is admitted to *regular bail* pending trial, *subject to* the following conditions:
 - 16.1. The petitioner shall furnish a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rs. Twenty-five thousand Only) with 01 surety in the like amount from a family member, to the satisfaction of the learned trial court;
 - 16.2. The petitioner shall furnish to the Investigating Officer (‘I.O.’)/S.H.O a cellphone number on which the petitioner may be contacted at any time and shall ensure that the number is kept active and switched-on at all times;
 - 16.3. If the petitioner has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the learned trial court and shall not travel out of the country without prior permission of the learned trial court;



- 16.4. The petitioner shall not contact, nor visit, nor offer any inducement, threat or promise to any of the prosecution witnesses or other persons acquainted with the facts of case. The petitioner shall not tamper with evidence nor otherwise indulge in any act or omission that is unlawful or that would prejudice the proceedings in the pending trial; and
- 16.5. In case of any change in his residential address/contact details, the petitioner shall promptly inform the I.O. in writing.
17. Since the petitioner is facing trial and would therefore be appearing before the learned trial court from time-to-time, it is not considered necessary to impose a reporting requirement as a condition of regular bail.
18. Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the pending matter.
19. A copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent *forthwith*.
20. The petition stands disposed-of in the above terms.
21. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MAY 29, 2026

SS