



\$~1

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2876/2025**

NIKHIL SATI

...Applicant

Through: Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Chinma Sejwal, Ms. Janvi Narang, Ms. Geetanjali Reddy and Mr. Bagav Priyadarshni, Mr. Atiq Ur Rehman and Mr. Yadav, Adv.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR. ...Respondents

Through: Mr. Raghuinder Verma, APP for the State with Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh, Ms. Upasna Bakshi and Ms. Niketa Manish, Adv.

Mr. Mayank Mikhail Mukherjee, Adv. for R-2 (Through VC)

SI-Deepali Chhabra, PS: Rajouri Garden

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **26.05.2026**

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in proceedings arising out of FIR No.200/2025 dated 04.04.2025 registered at PS: Rajouri Garden under *Sections 376(2)(n)/420/406* of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. *Succinctly put*, as per FIR, the prosecutrix and the applicant came into contact through online platform '*Hinge*' and after explicitly stating a mutual intention to get married in future, established sexual relations with each other in June, 2023. Since 01.07.2023, the applicant roughly sought *Rs.44 Lacs* within a span of *four months* from the prosecutrix, which she gave from time to time. Thereafter, the applicant withdrew from his

BAIL APPLN. 2876/2025

Page 1 of 4



promise to marry the prosecutrix, refused to return her money, and eventually stopped communicating with her, first saying that he had shifted to Aligarh, U.P., then telling her that he was moving to U.S.A., and finally blocked her on all platforms making it impossible for her to contact him. The prosecutrix then filed two complaints against the applicant *qua* which certain government officials representing the applicant threatened and intimidated her. However, eventually the present FIR was lodged.

3. In this factual backdrop, this Court has heard learned counsel for the applicant and the prosecutrix, who have also handed over their respective compilation of judgements along with the written synopsis, which are all taken on record. This Court has heard learned APP for the State as well.

4. A perusal of the record reveals that the prosecutrix has remained steadfast about her unequivocal stance wherein she has clearly set out the sequence of events, whereby first the applicant made her a promise to marry and then established sexual relations with her, prior to repeatedly asking for monies from her, and after obtaining the same, changing his colours by reneging therefrom and blocking her. Moreover, the applicant has not disputed any of the money transfers but has merely stated that some of the amounts have been returned by a third party. It, thus, cannot be ignored that this is also a case of cheating by the applicant of a huge quantum, extending from time to time.

5. In this regard, though learned senior counsel for applicant has relied upon the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Pramod Kumar Navratna vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors.:2026 SCC OnLine SC 154*** and ***Nitin B. Nikhare vs. State of Maharashtra & Anr. [order dated 21.01.2025 in SLP (Crl.) 1889/2024]*** as also the decision of this Court in



Sushant Kaushik vs. State [order dated 31.01.2023 in Bail Appln. 3175/2023] to contend otherwise, however, none of them can come to the aid of the applicant at this stage, particularly since in both ***Pramod Kumar Navratna (supra)*** and ***Sushant Kaushik (supra)***, the prosecutrix herself was already married at the time of meeting the accused therein, and in fact in the latter case, the prosecutrix was the *professor* of the accused and 15 years elder to him. Even in ***Nitin B. Nikhare (supra)***, it was emphasised that the subsequent conduct was relevant to establish whether the promise to marry was false to begin with, and in those facts, it was found that the promise was made *bona fide* and marriage between the parties did not take place due to other reasons.

6. In the present case, there are no such adverse factors which can create a presumption in favour of the applicant. Rather his coming in contact with the prosecutrix, developing relations with her and then repeatedly asking for monies from time to time, and his finally blocking her thereafter all create a presumption against him, which is relevant for consideration while dealing with the present bail application wherein this Court is only to take a preliminary view. In fact, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Anurag Soni vs. State of Chhattisgarh:(2019) 13 SCC 1*** has also laid down certain guidelines *qua* false pretext of marriage, which when taken into consideration, are squarely applicable to the facts of the present case, especially for arriving at a *prima facie* view at this stage.

7. Lastly, there are also allegations *qua* the prosecutrix facing threatening and intimidation by and on behalf of the applicant which raises an apprehension *qua* the applicant causing duress to the prosecutrix as also the other witnesses and tampering with the evidence if released on bail.



8. Therefore, taking a cumulative view of the facts and circumstances involved, this Court does not see the present as a fit case for grant of regular bail to the applicant.

9. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.

10. Needless to say, expression of view(s), if any, on the merits are solely for the purposes of adjudication of the present application and shall have no bearing on the criminal proceedings involved.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

MAY 26, 2026/Ab