



2026:DHC:8587



\$~78

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision: 29.09.2026**# **CNR No. DLHC010464182026**+ **BAIL APPLN. 4096/2026**

PREETI SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. L.K. Verma, Ms. Bobby Verma
and Mr. Hritik Verma, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA****SACHIN DATTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The applicant/petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 276/2026, dated 12.08.2026, registered at PS Maidan Garhi, Delhi, under Sections 110/126(2)/332(C)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that the dispute is between persons who are known/related to each other; the scuffle actually took place between the applicant's sisters-in-law.
3. It is submitted that the incident took place on 08.08.2026. The MLC records the injuries as simple. The complaint came to be filed only four days after the incident, *i.e.*, on 12.08.2026.
4. Issue notice.
5. Mr. Hemant Mehla, learned APP for the State, accepts notice on behalf of the State.
6. It is pointed out that the co-accused Rajvir Singh, husband of the



2026:DHC:8587



applicant/petitioner, has already been granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court in **Rajvir Singh v. State of NCT of Delhi**, Bail Appln. 4006/2026, *vide* order dated 23.09.2026. The said order reads as under:

2. The applicant/petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 267/2026, registered at PS Maidan Garhi, under Sections 110/126(2)/332(C)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. Although the applicant/petitioner was initially granted interim protection by the learned Sessions Court, his anticipatory bail application eventually came to be dismissed *vide* order dated 15.09.2026.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that the dispute is between persons who are known/related to each other; the scuffle actually took place between the applicant's sister and bhabhi.
5. It is submitted that the incident took place on 08.08.2026. The MLC records the injuries as simple. The complaint came to be filed only four days after the incident, *i.e.*, on 12.08.2026.
6. Issue notice.
7. Mr. Hemant Mehla, learned APP for the State, accepts notice on behalf of the State.
8. Let a status report be filed before the next date of hearing.
9. In the meantime, the applicant/petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon by the Investigating Officer. Subject thereto, till the next date of hearing, in the event of an arrest, the applicant/petitioner shall be released on bail, on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000, with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer.
10. It is undertaken by the applicant/petitioner that he shall neither interact with the complainant nor visit her place of habitation.
11. List on 25.01.2027.

7. It is pertinent to note that the applicant/petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Further, the applicant/petitioner has admittedly joined the investigation from time to time.

8. The Supreme Court in **Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi)**,



2026:DHC:8587



(2020) 5 SCC 1, while discussing the contours of the Court's power to grant anticipatory bail, quoted the following observation made in **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab**, (1980) 2 SCC 565:

"7.3. ... An order of anticipatory bail does not in any way, directly or indirectly, take away from the police their right to investigate into charges made or to be made against the person released on bail. In fact, two of the usual conditions incorporated in a direction issued under Section 438(1) are those recommended in sub-sections (2)(i) and (ii) which require the applicant to cooperate with the police and to assure that he shall not tamper with the witnesses during and after the investigation. While granting relief under Section 438(1), appropriate conditions can be imposed under Section 438(2) so as to ensure an uninterrupted investigation." (emphasis supplied)

9. It is also worth noting that **Sushila Aggarwal (Supra)** quoted **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra**, (2011) 1 SCC 694, wherein the apex Court remarked:

"89. It is imperative for the courts to carefully and with meticulous precision evaluate the facts of the case. The discretion must be exercised on the basis of the available material and the facts of the particular case. In cases where the court is of the considered view that the accused has joined investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigating agency and is not likely to abscond, in that event, custodial interrogation should be avoided." (emphasis supplied)

10. The Supreme Court in **Sushila Aggarwal (Supra)**, after taking note of several precedents, made the following observation, which is *inter alia* reproduced below:

"52.2. Grant of an order under Section 438(1) does not per se hamper investigation of an offence; Sections 438(1)(i) and (ii) enjoin that an accused/applicant should cooperate with investigation. Sibbia also stated that courts can fashion appropriate conditions governing bail, as well. One condition can be that if the police makes out a case of likely recovery of objects or



2026:DHC:8587



discovery of facts under Section 27 (of the Evidence Act, 1872), the accused may be taken into custody. Given that there is no formal method prescribed by Section 46 of the Code if recovery is made during a statement (to the police) and pursuant to the accused volunteering the fact, it would be a case of recovery during “deemed arrest”.” (emphasis supplied)

11. The aforesaid observations by the Supreme Court in various precedents make it clear that protection from arrest does not prejudice the pending investigation.

12. Although it is the assertion of the State that there is specific attribution made to the applicant/petitioner in allegations in the FIR, the aspect that the applicant/petitioner has joined the investigation from time to time and the fact that the co-accused (husband of the petitioner) has been granted interim anticipatory bail weigh with this Court.

13. Considering the same and also taking into account that there are no criminal antecedents of the applicant/petitioner, the applicant/petitioner is granted anticipatory bail.

14. Accordingly, in the event of arrest, the applicant/petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. In such case, the applicant/petitioner shall be subject to the following conditions:

- i. The applicant/petitioner shall not leave NCT of Delhi or travel out of the country without prior permission of the Trial Court;
- ii. The applicant/petitioner shall provide his permanent address to the Trial Court, and also the address where she will be residing during the pendency of the case;
- iii. The applicant/petitioner shall intimate the Investigating Officer



2026:DHC:8587



- (IO) and file an affidavit before the Trial Court regarding any change in her residential address;
- iv. The applicant/petitioner shall furnish her mobile number to the Investigating Officer (IO)/Station House Officer (SHO) concerned, which shall be kept in working condition at all times. The mobile number shall be kept switched on, with location services enabled at all times, and the same shall be shared with the IO. The mobile number shall not be changed without prior intimation to the IO during the pendency of the trial;
 - v. The applicant/petitioner shall report to the IO as and when called for by the IO.
 - vi. The applicant/petitioner shall not directly or indirectly contact the complainant/victim, any prosecution witness, and their family members;
 - vii. The applicant/petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat, or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;
 - viii. The applicant/petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every date of hearing;
 - ix. The applicant/petitioner shall not indulge in any criminal activity during the period of bail; and
 - x. The applicant/petitioner shall report to the concerned SHO, on the first Monday of every month at 11:00 a.m. and be discharged by 12:00 noon, after recording his presence and



2026:DHC:8587



completion of the necessary formalities.

15. If any of these conditions is breached, it shall be open for the State to seek cancellation of bail.

16. The application is disposed of in the above terms. The pending application also stands disposed of.

17. It is clarified that the observations made herein are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and shall neither influence the trial proceedings nor be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

SACHIN DATTA, J

SEPTEMBER 29, 2026/at/vk