

Bail Application No. 1284/2026
STATE Vs. PAWAN CHAUDHARY
FIR No. NOT KNOWN/2026
PS Fatehpuri Beri

Present: Sh. Naresh Choudhary, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Dhiraj Bhiduri and ms. Sandhya Rani, Ld. Counsels
for the accused/applicant.
IO SI Vikas Yadav in person.

This is an application seeking anticipatory bail under
Section 482 BNSS moved on behalf of applicant/accused **Pawan
Chaudhary**.

Reply filed by the IO.

Arguments heard and record perused.

01. The facts of the present case as may be taken note of from the
reply filed by the IO and the same is reproduced as follows: “*the
applicant has alleged in his bail application that on 16.06.2026 at
about 6:00 am, police officials came to his house and illegally
arrested/kidnapped his wife and daughter without any warrant or
notice.*

*It is submitted that on 15.06.2026, a PCR call vide GD No.
108A was received at PS Fatehpur Beri with the information that two
ladies had forcibly entered a house, were quarrelling with the caller
and were demanding property related documents. The said call was
assigned to HC Jitender, who alongwith police staff including a
woman constable reached the spot at Plot No. 11, Ambedkar Colony,*

Gali No. 04, Aya Nagar, New Delhi.

At the spot, the caller namely Kishan Lal aged about 73 years alongwith his wife Smt. Rammurti aged about 65 years was found. The complainant purchased the property in question in 2003 from one Ram Nath and the possession of the said property was restored in 2023 through a court bailiff pursuant to the orders passed by the Civil Court at Saket. He further alleged that the applicant and his family members had been attempting to take possession of the property for several years.

During inquiry, it was found that two ladies namely Pinki Choudhary and Ridhima Choudhary, wife and daughter of the applicant Pawan Choudhary respectively, had entered the complainant's premises and had locked themselves inside a room situated therein. Despite repeated requests by the police staff, they refused to come out of the room, behaved rudely with the police officials, used abusive language and continued to remain inside the room throughout the night.

On the morning of 16.06.2026, both the ladies voluntarily came out of the room and prior to coming out, they themselves made a PCR call at 112, which was received at PS Fatehpur Beri vide GD No. 25A at 5:55 am and same was marked to SI Ravi Raghav, who alongwith Ct. Karma reached at the spot. Thereafter, both the women were brought to the police station. During inquiry, they failed to cooperate and could not produce any document supporting their claim over the property and repeatedly changed their versions and thereafter, both

were detained under Section 65 Delhi Police Act and after medical examination, both the ladies were released in sound physical condition.”

02. In the course of arguments, the IO submits that no FIR in this case has been registered against the applicant and there is no requirement of his arrest. As per the reply, wife and daughter of the applicant were apprehended as they forcibly entered into the house of the informant and locked inside the room. They were apprehended by the police under Section 65 Delhi Police Act and were medically examined.

03. On perusal of the record, there appears to be civil dispute regarding possession of the property. So far no criminal case has been filed against the applicant. There is no reasonable apprehension of arrest and hence, not maintainable at this stage and accordingly, the present bail application stands dismissed.

Application stands disposed off.

Copy of the order be given dasti to all concerned.

(Pawan Kumar)
Vacation Judge/ASJ-06 (South)
Saket Courts/ New Delhi/25.06.2026