



\$~6

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **BAIL APPLN. 4204/2025**  
**SUNIL KUMAR YADAV** .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravin Rao, Mr. Akshit Sawal, Mr.  
Ayan Sharma, Mr. Pallav Gupta Ms.  
Jannat Garg and Ms. Palak J.,  
Advocates.

versus

**THE STATE NCT OF DELHI** .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for the State  
with SI Vipin.  
Mr. Shashi Shankar, Ms. Pooja  
Mohanani, Mr. Guneet Kaur Bhatia  
and Mr. Arnav Dhama, Advocates for  
R-2.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**ORDER**  
**09.03.2026**

%

1. Applicant seeks regular bail in a case arising out of FIR No.0431/2024 dated 03.06.2024, for commission of offences under Sections 498A/304B/34 IPC, registered at P.S. Wazirabad.
2. As per prosecution story, an intimation about admission of Geetika Yadav (deceased/ victim) in Burari Hospital was received by the police on 01.06.2024. Injuries were, allegedly, on account of fall from the height (second floor), half an hour ago, and as per MLC, she had been brought to the hospital by her husband and family members.
3. The victim was declared dead, same evening.
4. The police was also apprised that the victim was having history of

**BAIL APPLN. 4204/2025**

**1**



psychiatric illness.

5. Her relatives, however, made statements before the police and concerned SDM and based on further enquiry and their statements, the abovesaid case was registered.

6. The marriage between victim and applicant herein had taken place on 14.02.2024 as per Hindu rites and customs, and apparently, in less than four months of such marriage, the abovesaid death has taken place under circumstances other than normal. As per the statements made by the relatives of the victim, there were demands of dowry.

7. There are three other accused but fact remains that they were never arrested during the investigation, *albeit*, they are also facing trial for same offences i.e. under Sections 498A/304B/34 IPC, in alternate for offence under Sections 302/34 IPC.

8. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the complainant, while opposing the bail *plea* of the applicant, strongly relies upon the *post-mortem* report and subsequent opinion given by the autopsy surgeon. They submit that the applicant does not deserve to be enlarged on bail as it is a clear-cut case where the deceased was tortured, assaulted and was thereafter thrown from the roof of the house.

9. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant was arrested on 14.06.2024 and continues to be in incarceration since then. He submits that after the charges were ascertained, the prosecution has already examined all the material witnesses, including all such relatives of the victim. He supplements that even the autopsy surgeon has been examined and his testimony falsifies the theory of assault before death. Learned counsel for the applicant has made elaborate reference to his testimony in order to



demonstrate that it was never a case of any assault and the injuries received by the victim at the time of alleged fall, which was suicidal in nature, were direct outcome of her coming in contact with some wires and also on account of her existing psychiatric disorder.

10. It is also argued that even before the marriage in question, the victim was taking treatment from *Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences* (IHBAS) and the documents in this regard were collected by the prosecution and were placed on record alongwith charge-sheet. It is contended that she was prescribed Antipsychotic medicines for her psychiatric disorder and her suicide has nothing to do with alleged cruelty or dowry.

11. Since the trial is mid-way, it will not be appropriate for this Court to give any observation on the merits of the case, either way.

12. Fact, however, remains that out of the cited 29 witnesses, only 10 witnesses have been examined so far and there is no likelihood of completion of trial in near future. Moreover, all the material PWs have been examined and, therefore, there is no possibility of accused trying to influence or threaten them.

13. In terms of last order, the applicant has filed affidavit, specifying the details of the two other cases, in which he was involved. In one such case i.e. FIR No.636/2023 registered under Sections 376/377/328 IPC, at P.S. Shalimar Bagh, the applicant is already on anticipatory bail as would be evident from order dated 10.01.2024 and with respect to the other case, arising out of FIR No.353/2023 registered at P.S. Burari, it was for commission of offences under Section 506/509 IPC and the proceedings thereof have already been quashed by this Court. Copy of such order has also been placed on record.



14. Keeping in mind the overall facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing any opinion over the merits of the case, the applicant is, hereby, directed to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond in a sum of Rs. 25,000/- with two sureties of like amount, subject to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate with the following conditions: -

- i. Applicant shall not try to meet and contact any family member of victim, directly or indirectly.
- ii. Applicant shall provide his Mobile Number to the concerned I.O and shall ensure that such Mobile Number remains active and operational, till the disposal of the case by the learned Trial Court.

15. Application stands disposed of.

16. A copy of this order be sent to the concerned Court and also to the Jail Superintendent for necessary information and compliance.

**MANOJ JAIN, J**

**MARCH 9, 2026/ss/sa**