



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 5014/2025**
LUVKUSH PANDEYPetitioner

Through: Mr. Tarun Rana, Mr. Pradeep Singh,
Mr. Sanny Pandey, Mr. Palash Singh,
Mr. Shivam Verma and Mr. Mayur
Rexwal, Advocates

versus

THE STATE OF NCT DELHIRespondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP
Mr. Bhupender Singh and Mr. Gaurav
Rana, Advocates for complainant
SI Pooja, PS Bhalswa Dairy

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
09.01.2026

%

1. FIR No. 836/2025 under Sections 64/351 *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (corresponding Sections 376(1) & 376(2)/503 IPC) and under Section 6 of *Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012* Police Station Bhalswa Dairy has been registered against petitioner herein who seeks anticipatory bail under Section 482 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*.
2. As per the allegations, complainant along with her father had come to police station and reported that accused had touched her private parts, kissed her, inserted finger in her private parts and even threatened her in case she revealed anything to anyone.
3. It seems that on account of fear, victim did not confide in anyone and, eventually, when her father learnt about the incident from the whatsapp messages, matter was reported to the police.

BAIL APPLN. 5014/2025

1



4. Police, in order to apprehend accused, had gone to his native place i.e. Chitrakoot, Uttar Pradesh but could not arrest him.
5. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that it is a false case and since he was having some authority over the seat of temple, on account of some vendetta, he has been falsely implicated in the present matter.
6. Learned Addl. P.P. for State and learned counsel for complainant have, however, submitted that after gaining knowledge of the mobile number of the victim, accused started sending her regular messages and he also used to delete all such message immediately thereafter.
7. A comprehensive status report in this regard has been filed. Copy thereof has already been supplied to the learned counsel for petitioner.
8. Admittedly, petitioner is stated to be in his late fifties and a priest in the temple in question where incident in question has taken place.
9. Keeping in mind the severity of the allegations and the fact that petitioner had been conversing with the victim and had also, himself, deleted various messages and chat, this Court is not inclined to release him on anticipatory bail as in view of the given factual matrix, his custodial interrogation seems very much imperative.
10. Application is accordingly dismissed.

MANOJ JAIN, J

JANUARY 9, 2026/dr/sy