

4 BAIL MATTERS 565/2026
THE STATE Vs. URMILA SHARMA
FIR No. 151/2026
(KARAWAL NAGAR)

20.06.2026

Present: Sh. Shiv Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. S K Shukla and Ms. Tannu, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused.
Complainant is present.
IO SI Subah Singh is present.

This is an application filed on behalf of applicant/accused Urmila Sharma u/s 482 of BNSS seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the accused.

Reply to the application has already been filed by the IO. Copy of the same also already stands supplied to the Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Submissions are heard on the application. Reply to the application is also perused.

In the present case, the case FIR has been registered on the complaint of Ms. Shikha Sharma for the commission of offence u/s 85/316(2)/351(2)/74/3(5) BNSS and section 4 of DP Act as it is alleged that the complainant who got married to accused Govind Sharma on 18.04.2024 was subjected to cruelty by her husband as well as other members of his family in relation to the demand of dowry. It is also alleged by the complainant that her husband also used to pressurized her to make an obscene video while establishing physical relationship. Further her father in law also physically assaulted and used criminal

force upon her with intent to outrage her modesty as he used to inappropriately touch her.

While arguing on behalf of applicant/accused and seeking him anticipatory bail, the Ld. Counsel for accused has argued that all the allegations leveled against the accused are false and fabricated. It is further argued that moreover, there is a delay of more than one year in reporting of the alleged incident, which allegedly took place during the period between 18.04.2024 to 26.04.2024 and May 2024 and August 2024, whereas, the first complaint to the alleged acts was made by the complainant only on 02.06.2026. It is argued that, moreover, despite the claim of the complainant that she was subjected to cruelty and physical beating by her husband, not a single medical record pertaining to any such beating or physical harm was produced by the complainant to the IO. It is stated that likewise, not a single complaint in relation to any cruelty or demand of dowry was ever made by the complainant or any of his family members immediately after the alleged incidents or demands except the police complaint which itself reveals manipulations on their part. It is argued that moreover, the allegation relating to the commission of cruelty and demand of dowry are also very general in nature without any specific mention of the date of such incident etc.

The Ld. Counsel further submits that moreover, the applicant/accused has already joined the investigation of the case and she is also duly cooperating in the same. Further, there is also no requirement of custodial interrogation of the accused for any purpose as nothing has to be recovered in the present case and the case of the prosecution solely rests upon the statements of the complainant and her other family members.

Hence, it is prayed that the anticipatory bail may be granted to the applicant/accused.

It is relevant to note here that as per the reply filed by the IO, the applicant/accused has already joined the investigation of the case after the service of notice of section 35(3) of BNSS and has been already thoroughly interrogated. It is also mentioned that presently, there is no need of any custodial interrogation of the accused.

Per contra, opposing the bail application, the Id. Addl. PP for State has argued that all the offences alleged against the accused are very serious in nature. It is further submitted that the investigation of the case is still in progress and though the present applicant/accused has joined the investigation, however, considering the seriousness of alleged offences and entailing punishment, there are high chances that the accused may abscond or try to temper with prosecution evidence. Hence, it is prayed that the present anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of accused may be dismissed.

After hearing of submissions of both the sides and perusing the reply filed by the IO, it is apparent that accused has already duly joined the investigation post service of notice u/s 35(3) BNSS and she is also fully cooperating in the investigation. Further, admittedly, there is also a considerable delay in reporting of the incident. Admittedly, there is also no medical record pertaining to the alleged beating of the complainant at the hand of her husband available in the present case.

Admittedly, there is no recovery to be effected in the present case. Further since, as apparent, the case of the prosecution also solely rests upon the statement of the complainant and her other family

members and there is also no other documentary or any other evidence available in the present case which may be tampered in any manner. The IO in his reply has also already stated that presently, custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is also not required for any purpose. Further, there is also no apprehension that the applicant/accused may abscond or run away from the process of trial.

Hence considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and the position as emerging from the record since there is no requirement of any custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused, the court is of the opinion that she is entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail in the present case.

Accordingly, the application filed on behalf of applicant/accused stands allowed.

The applicant/accused Urmila Sharma is directed to join the investigation and in case of his arrest, following directions shall be followed :-

*i) In the event of arrest of the applicant/accused, she be released on bail. The amount of bail bond shall be **Rs. 20,000/- with one surety** in like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned IO/SHO.*

ii) The applicant/accused shall cooperate in the investigation at every stage, and shall make herself available for interrogation by the police as and when required.

iii) The applicant /accused shall provide his latest address to the IO /SHO concerned and in the event of change of address, he shall ensure that he provides her fresh address to IO /SHO concerned immediately.

iv). The applicant/accused shall not leave India without prior permission of the court.

v) The applicant/accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him or her from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer.

With these conditions, the present anticipatory bail application moved on behalf of applicant/accused Urmila Sharma stands disposed off.

It is needless to say that nothing stated herein shall tantamount to an opinion or expression of the Court on the merits of the case.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the parties.

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

(BALWINDER SINGH)
ASJ (FTC) (Vacation Judge)
/North- East/KKD Courts/
Delhi/20.06.2026