



\$~3

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 04.09.2025

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2750/2025**

MANISH KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yogesh Sharma and Ms. Pratima,  
Advocates

versus

STATE (THROUGH SHO PS CHITTRANJAN PARK)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for State  
with SI Neetu, PS C.R. Park  
Mr. Nitish Banka and Mr. Lakshay  
Manchanda, Advocates for  
prosecutrix**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 88/2025 of PS Chittaranjan Park for offence under Section 376 IPC. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant as well as learned APP for State and learned counsel for prosecutrix.

2. Broadly speaking, prosecution case as unfolded through the FIR registered on the statement of prosecutrix is as follows.

BAIL APPLN. 2750/2025

Page 1 of 7 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed  
By: NEETU NAIR  
Signing Date: 04.09.2025  
14:56:28**GIRISH  
KATHPALIA**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA  
DN: cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,  
c=IN, email=girish.kathpalia@delhihi.org, ou=HIGH COURT OF  
DELHI, postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,  
serialNumber=d3d8b796451ec45c07b5d1557099b0409b  
0c3d28ee0402c487965f801e206a, cn=GIRISH  
KATHPALIA  
Date: 2025.09.04 13:36:26 +07'00'

2.4 In the second week of September 2019, the accused/applicant took the prosecutrix to the house of his friend, who was not at home and there they spent 2-3 hours during which on his promise to get married within a year or



two, they indulged in sexual relationship, after which he dropped her home.

2.5 Over a period of time, their relationship got stronger with frequent meetings in Delhi and frequent visits together outside Delhi as well and they continued their sexual relations.

2.6 In January 2020, when she was hospitalized, the accused/applicant visited her and continued to support her, however, in January 2020, she started sensing something wrong in his behavior as if he was concealing something. But their relationship continued. Whenever he would receive phone calls from his wife in presence of the prosecutrix, he would tell her that the lady calling is his ex-girlfriend. That also made the prosecutrix feel uneasy, but she continued the relationship.

2.7 From September 2020, the accused/applicant also started taking the prosecutrix to his family home multiple times where they would spend time alone. In October 2020 also they travelled outside Delhi, after which in November 2020 he introduced her to his cousins but they also did not mention about his marital status. In June 2021, she also met his parents. Thereafter, in December 2021, also he took her to New Year party at his sister's home where all his family members were present but did not indicate that he was married. In March 2021, the prosecutrix took him to her hometown in Uttarakhand and introduced him to her family.

2.8 Across further period also their relationship continued. Even after he shifted to a new apartment in the year 2022 the prosecutrix would visit him

BAIL APPLN. 2750/2025

Page 3 of 7 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed  
By: NEETU N NAIR  
Signing Date: 04.09.2025  
14:56:28

GIRISH  
KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA  
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,  
2.5.4.20=8071A889B27A7702899A46A455694796249B,  
4835A83977626C6A, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, cn=  
GIRISH KATHPALIA, serialNumber=4348879645, c=IN,  
email=8071A889B27A7702899A46A455694796249B@  
delhihi.nic.in, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,  
cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA  
Date: 2025.09.04 13:57:04 +0700

2.11 According to the prosecutrix, she discovered the deceit in December 2022-January 2023 when the accused/applicant visited her in Dublin and convinced her to finance their Europe trip, which she did and they travelled together to various destinations in Europe in January 2023 at her cost. It is during that trip on the night of 04.01.2023 when the accused/applicant was drunk, she accessed his mobile phone and discovered the pictures and WhatsApp chats revealing that he was already married and dating other women. But she did not disclose him about the revelation from mobile phone and they returned. On 11.01.2023, she confronted him about his marital status and told him about her having seen the material in his mobile

2.12 Ultimately, on 22.04.2025 the prosecutrix lodged police complaint which was registered as the FIR.

3. On behalf of accused/applicant, it is contended that the FIR is based on an extraordinarily long complaint. It is also argued that the prosecutrix being a well educated working lady travelling even abroad repeatedly in connection with her work, it is not believable that she would be so gullible as to enter into long time sexual relations with the accused/applicant, blindly believing his promise to get married, which promise would be kept alive for so many years. It is also contended that since the prosecutrix herself claims that she visited residence of the accused/applicant number of times and even met his parents, sister and cousins, it is not believable that on those visits across such a long period, she would not have come across any material reflecting that the accused/applicant is a married man. Further, it is contended that in January 2020 itself, the prosecutrix claims to have sensed something wrong but she continued relationship with the accused/applicant, which clearly shows that it was a consensual relationship between the two. Even after the alleged revelation of marital status of the accused/applicant in January 2023, the prosecutrix did not lodge any complaint for more than two years and that, according to learned counsel for accused/applicant raises strong suspicion about truthfulness of the FIR.

8. At this stage, I must add a cautious rider that the above observations



are only for limited purpose of deciding the issue of liberty of the accused/applicant by ascertaining as to whether there is sufficient material connecting the accused/applicant with the alleged offence. None of the above observations shall be kept in mind by the trial court at the final outcome of the proceedings.

9. In view of above discussion, I do not find any reason to deprive the accused/applicant of liberty. The application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of his arrest, the accused/applicant shall be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the IO/SHO. It is also directed that the petitioner shall join investigation, as and when directed by the IO in writing.

**GIRISH  
KATHPALIA**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA  
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,  
2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4afec45569af3962c6  
fb4835d435f97626cacca, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, CID =  
7047638, postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,  
serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5d15570996b40f80c  
bd2eeef60402c487965f8b01e26fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA  
Date: 2025.09.04 13:38:00 -07'00'

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**SEPTEMBER 04, 2025/as**