

BAIL MATTERS 512/2026
THE STATE Vs. RAVI KUMAR
FIR No-0287/2026
PS-(New Usman Pur)

04.07.2026

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Gambhir Chauhan and Sh. R.K Singh, Ld. Counsels
for applicant/accused.
Sh. Avdhesh Saraswat, Ld. Counsel for complainant
through VC.
Brother of deceased in person.
IO Insp. Manoj Kataria in person.

1. The present application has been moved U/s 482 of BNSS 2023, seeking grant of anticipatory bail for applicant/accused **Ravi Kumar**, who is apprehending arrest in case FIR no-0287/2026, PS New Usmanpur, registered U/s 80/85/3(5) of BNS.
2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that similar application is neither pending nor has been recently dismissed by any higher court.
3. Reply has been filed today. Copy supplied.
4. Shorn off unnecessary details, the brief facts of this case are that marriage between the deceased and applicant/accused was solemnized on 20.02.2019. After about 01 year of marriage, applicant/accused and other in-laws of the deceased started pressurizing the deceased for bringing a car and Rs. 02 lacs. She never revealed the atrocities of the applicant/accused and his family member openly because she did not want to bring the same in knowledge of her father who was not keeping well during that period. She had called the complainant on the date of incident

-2-

also. The deceased had told the complainant that her in-laws including the applicant/accused were demanding dowry of Rs. 02 lacs and a car.

5. During course of arguments, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that applicant/accused is a law abiding citizen of India who has been falsely implicated in this case. He is working in a private company and on the date of incident, he was on duty. He was informed about the incident by his father-in-law. Ld. Counsel has further submitted that on insistence of his deceased wife, applicant/accused had given Rs. 1.5 lacs to Brijmohan (brother of the deceased) to purchase a jhuggi in Mangolpuri. Contention raised by Ld. Counsel is that applicant/accused was himself extending help to the family of the deceased. Such a helpful person can not be expected to demand dowry from his wife or to harass her for the same. Ld. Counsel has lastly submitted that in compliance of the directions issued by this court, applicant/accused has already joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

6. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has submitted that the deceased had died an unnatural death within 07 years of her marriage. The brother of the deceased had levelled clear allegations of demand of Rs. 02 lacs and a car and cruelty and harassment upon the deceased by the applicant/accused and her in-laws. The applicant/accused had although joined the investigation but has not provided any cooperation. Electronic evidence has to be collected through the custodial interrogation, hence, Ld. Addl. PP has submitted that application be dismissed.

7. Submissions heard. Record has been perused.

-3-

8. In case titled as ***“X Vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr. Spl. Leave Petition (criminal) No-13378/2024”***, the Hon’ble Apex Court of India has observed that in serious offences like murder, dacoity, rape etc., bail applications of the accused should not ordinarily be entertained by the trial courts and high courts. The detailed observations made by Supreme Court of India in this regard are as under:-

“14. Ordinarily in serious offences like rape, murder, dacoity, etc., once the trial commences and the prosecution starts examining its witnesses, the Court be it the Trial Court or the High Court should be loath in entertaining the bail application of the accused.

15. Over a period of time, we have noticed two things, i.e., (i) either bail is granted after the charge is framed and just before the victim is to be examined by the prosecution before the trial court, or (ii) bail is granted once the recording of the oral evidence of the victim is complete by looking into some discrepancies here or there in the deposition and thereby testing the credibility of the victim.

16. We are of the view that the aforesaid is not a correct practice that the Courts below should adopt. Once the trial commences, it should be allowed to reach to its final conclusion which may either result in the conviction of the accused or acquittal of the accused. The moment the High Court exercises its discretion in favour of the accused and orders release of the accused on bail by looking into the deposition of the victim, it will have its own impact on the pending trial when it comes to appreciating the oral evidence of the victim. It is only in the event if the trial gets unduly delayed and that too for no fault on the part of the accused, the Court may be justified in ordering his release on bail on the ground that right of the accused to have a speedy trial has been infringed.”

9. Here in this case, allegations against the applicant/accused are for offence U/s 80/85/3(5) of BNS which are no doubt serious allegations.

-4-

10. Further, the IO has mentioned in his reply that although the applicant/accused has joined the investigation but has not provided any cooperation in the investigation. The mobile phone of the applicant/accused is yet to be recovered and his CDR is also to be analyzed. Moreover, most of the witnesses are close relatives of the applicant/accused and if released on bail, he might influence the witnesses in his favour.

11. Thus, considering the seriousness of offence, stage of trial and reply of the investigating agency, this court is not inclined to release the applicant/accused on bail.

12. Accordingly, the application is **dismissed**.

13. It is needless to say that nothing stated hereinabove shall tantamount to expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

14. Application stands disposed of.

15. Copy of this order be given dasti.

16. **Ordered accordingly.**

(Babru Bhan)
ASJ-04/North-East District
KKD/Delhi/04.07.2026