



2026:DHC:5579



\$~8

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

% *Date of Decision: 13.07.2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2257/2026, CRL.M.A. 18081/2026, 18118/2026 & 18082/2026**

KARAN PARCHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Panna Lal Sharma, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with Inspector/Adesh Kumar.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicant seeks interim bail for a period of one month in case FIR No.727/2022 of PS Vijay Vihar for offence under Section 376(2)(n)/506 IPC and 66E & 67 of IT Act.
2. The status report is stated to have been filed by prosecution but the same is not on record.
3. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP



2026:DHC:5579



for State assisted by Investigating Officer/Inspector Adesh Kumar.

4. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant is that he raped the prosecutrix and posted her objectionable pictures on Instagram. The interim bail sought by the accused/applicant is on the ground that he has to get his child admitted in a school.

5. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that page 32 of the paperbook is a copy of the fee slip, reflecting the fees required to be paid to the school and for arranging money, the accused/applicant has to come out.

6. Learned APP strongly opposes the interim bail on the ground of severity of offence as well as the fact that mother of the accused/applicant is already employed with MCD and can easily pay the amount of Rs.6,000/-, as reflected from the fee slip filed by the accused/applicant. It is also contended that the accused/applicant is involved in as many as 18 more cases. On this, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that presently, only 5 cases are pending against the accused/applicant.

7. The fee slip relied upon by learned counsel for accused/applicant does not bear name of child of the accused/applicant. Even the amount mentioned in the slip is not such that mother of the accused/applicant, who is employed with MCD, is unable to spend.



2026:DHC:5579



8. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant interim bail. Therefore, the interim bail application and accompanying applications are dismissed.

9. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for being informed to the accused/applicant.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

JULY 13, 2026/ry