



2026:DHC:7006



\$~56

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

% *Date of Decision: 21.08.2026*

CNR No. DLHC010392002026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3463/2026 & CRL.M.A. 25801/2026**

ANKIT CHAUDHARYPetitioner

Through: Mr. Anant Gupta, Advocate

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with IO/SI Anjana

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

1. The applicant/accused seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 20/2024 of PS Delhi Cantt for offence under 328/420/411 IPC.
2. Learned APP for State, assisted by IO/SI Anjana, accepts notice and submits his formal opposition to this bail application.



3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant is as follows. On 12.01.2024, the lady complainant *de facto* lodged a complaint with the police alleging that on 08.01.2024 when she was coming to Delhi from Dehradun by bus, a person (*the present accused/applicant*) sitting adjacent to her gave her something to eat as she was suffering headache, after which she lost consciousness and started obeying the commands of the said person. She further alleged that the accused/applicant took her to Sadar Bazar and on his instructions, she transferred online through UPI Rs.23,000/- to one Panav Online Solutions Pvt. Ltd. and thereafter, he took away her gold jewellery including her *mangalsutra*, chain, ring and earrings.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the FIR allegations as mentioned above do not inspire confidence. It is submitted that the accused/applicant is in jail since 22.01.2024 and the complainant *de facto* is deliberately avoiding appearance before the trial court to record her testimony, so bailable warrants against her have been issued.

5. Learned APP for State, on instructions of the IO, submits that since the complainant *de facto* is suffering back pain and is pregnant, she is unable to appear in trial court. Further, it is submitted by the IO that the substance administered to the complainant *de facto* might have been Alprax tablet, because those tablets were recovered from bag of the accused/applicant apart from the gold jewellery.



6. The fact remains that there is no explanation at all as to why for the alleged incident of 08.01.2024, the complaint would be filed much belatedly on 12.01.2024 and thereafter, even the FIR would be registered more belatedly on 21.01.2024.

7. Further, admittedly, it is not a case of hypnosis as per the IO. It remains unexplained as to what was administered to the complainant *de facto* as alleged by her. The prosecution itself is not sure, so it is submitted by the IO that the administered substance “might have been” Alprax.

8. It would also be interesting to note that medical examination of the complainant *de facto* was conducted and MLC was prepared on 21.01.2024 i.e., about 13 days after the alleged incident.

9. It also appears strange that after she was administered some substance and allegedly lost consciousness, in that unconscious state the complainant *de facto* could be taken to the crowded area of Sadar Bazar without being noticed by anyone.

10. The prosecution case leaves a number of vacuum portions in its version and there seems to be much more than that meets the eye. That being so, liberty of the accused/applicant cannot be curtailed in such hazy



2026:DHC:7006



scenario. However, I must add a cautious rider that these observations have been recorded only while dealing with the rival submissions and at the stage of final arguments after trial, the learned trial court shall take an independent view.

11. Therefore, the bail application is allowed and accused/applicant is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

12. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 21, 2026/as