$~9

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010338932026**

\+ BAIL APPLN. 2988/2026 & CRL.M.A. 22563/2026

ARVIND KUMAR RAVI .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anup Kumar, Ms. Aching Priya, Ms. Shubhangi, Ms. Arshi, Mr. Satya Prakash and Mr. Ashutosh, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF DEHI & ANR. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for State.
SI Manish Kumar, P.S. Rajender Nagar.
Mr. Sumer Singh Boprai, Mr. Surya Pratap Singh, Mr. Abhilash Pathak, Mr. Kumar Gaurav and Mr. Parth Mudgal, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

O R D E R

% 03.11.2026

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.32/2026 dated 19th January, 2026 for offences under Sections 69/351 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita ('BNS'), 2023, registered at Police Station Rajinder Nagar, District Central Delhi, Delhi.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of the complainant alleging that the applicant/accused entered into a physical relationship with her on the pretext of false promise to marry her.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 05/11/2026 at 10:40:14

3. It is stated on behalf of the applicant that the applicant is innocent and did not commit the offence as alleged. It is further stated that the applicant is ready and willing to join the investigation.

4. Status report has been filed on behalf of the State opposing the grant of anticipatory bail. It is stated that the applicant established physical relations with the complainant on the basis of a false promise to marry. Subsequently, the applicant obtained Rs.1,00,000/- from the complainant and also retained her gold rings and electronic tablet. The applicant threatened the complainant by taking her private photographs and threatened to make them viral. The applicant has been absconding and has already been declared 'proclaimed person' *vide* order dated 15th September, 2026 passed by the Trial Court.

5. Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP, appearing on behalf of the State, strongly opposes the bail application.

6. Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant opposes the bail application. He places reliance on the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Prem Shankar Prasad v. State of Bihar***, (2022) 14 SCC 516.

7. I have heard the counsel for the parties.

8. A reference may be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Lavesh* v. *State (NCT of Delhi)***, (2012) 8 SCC 730, wherein it was held that there is no question of granting anticipatory bail to the accused when he is 'absconding' or is declared a 'proclaimed offender'. It is reiterated that when a person against whom a warrant had been issued and is absconding or concealing himself in order to avoid execution of said warrants and is declared as a 'proclaimed offender', that person is not entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 05/11/2026 at 10:40:14

9. In ***State of M.P.*** **v.** ***Pradeep Sharma*** (2014) 2 SCC 171, the Supreme Court, whilst discussing ***Lavesh*** (supra), allowed the appeals against the High Court order granting anticipatory bail to the accused, holding that in serious offences, the accused being a 'proclaimed offender' and not cooperating with the investigation, cannot be granted anticipatory bail.

10. The Supreme Court in ***Prem Shankar Prasad*** (supra), following the aforesaid judgements in ***Pradeep Sharma*** (supra) and ***Lavesh*** (supra), reversed the High Court order granting anticipatory bail to the accused. In the said judgment, it has been held as under:-

> *"6.5 Relying upon the decision of this Court in State of M.P. v. Pradeep Sharma, it is submitted that as observed and held by this Court a person against whom the proclamation has been issued and the proceedings under Sections 82/83 CrPC have been initiated, is not entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail."*

11. In the present case, the applicant has been declared a "proclaimed person" in terms of the order dated 15th September, 2026 passed by the Trial Court, noting that the applicant/accused is deliberately concealing himself from the execution of warrants.

12. A Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Satyam Chauhan*** **v.** ***State of NCT of Delhi***, BAIL APPLN., 2198/2025 [Judgment dated 05.08.2025] has denied anticipatory bail to the accused therein for offence under Section 69 BNS, 2023 since the proceedings to declare the accused person a 'proclaimed offender' had already commenced and despite efforts NBWs could not be executed against him.

13. As per the status report, the applicant established physical relations with the complainant based on assurances of promising to marry her and thereafter started avoiding her. Further, the applicant threatened to make the

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 05/11/2026 at 10:40:14

private pictures of the complainant viral, he also threatened to kill the complainant and her family members.

14. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the serious allegations made against the applicant, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

15. The application is dismissed.

AMIT BANSAL, J

NOVEMBER 3, 2026
Vivek/-

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 05/11/2026 at 10:40:14