

**Bail Matter 1734/2025**  
**FIR No. 329/2025**  
**PS AMAR COLONY**  
**U/s. 69 BNS**  
**STATE Vs. PARTH GUPTA**

10.09.2025

*The present application is being taken up pursuant to order No. 236 dated 04.09.2025 passed by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge, South-East District, Saket Courts (Roster).*

Present: Sh. R. K. Gurjar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Sh. Rajesh Kumar Singh alongwith Sh. Amit  
Bidhuri, Ms. Bhavna Malik, Sh. Saksham Verma,  
Sh. Yogesh Sharma, Sh. Bakul, Sh. Abhishek Bhati  
& Sh. Sagar Roy, Ld. Counsels for applicant/accused.  
Complainant/victim Ms. 'R' in person alongwith Ld.  
Advocate Sh. Vikas Bakshi.  
IO WSI Juli Goswami, PS Amar Colony, absent.

**This is an application filed U/s. 482 of BNSS, 2023, on behalf of applicant/accused Parth Gupta for grant of anticipatory bail.**

Reply already filed by IO, is perused.

Arguments heard on anticipatory bail application from both sides.

1. As per FIR, the complainant got introduced to applicant/accused Parth Gupta through Facebook in the year 2021. They had talking terms through Facebook for three years and they met face to face for the first time in May-2024. They developed deep friendship and applicant/accused proposed marriage to the complainant. The complainant told applicant /

*Contd..2.*

***Bail Matter 1734/2025***  
***FIR No. 329/2025***  
***PS AMAR COLONY***  
***U/s. 69 BNS***  
***STATE Vs. PARTH GUPTA***

***--2--***

accused that she had a daughter (aged around 14 years now) and that she was a single mother. The applicant/accused still insisted that he would marry her.

As per complaint, on the promise of marriage, applicant/accused took the complainant for picnics/outings to several places outside Delhi on multiple occasions from 07/09/2024 to 12/04/2025, during which the complainant acceded to sexual relations with him because of his promise of marriage.

However, on 27/05/2025, applicant/accused refused to marry the complainant on the pretext that they belonged to different communities.

2. Ld. Addl. PP and Ld. Counsel for complainant argued that the applicant/accused sexually exploited the complainant on false promise of marriage; the applicant/accused had some fake identity proof of complainant and he had been threatening to harm the complainant.

3. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused, on the other hand, argued that though applicant/accused had friendship with the complainant, he never promised to marry her. It is argued that the complainant concealed the fact that she is still married to one Sanjeev Bhatia, with whom she had a daughter. The complainant has been changing her identity over the years in government

***Contd..3.***

***Bail Matter 1734/2025***  
***FIR No. 329/2025***  
***PS AMAR COLONY***  
***U/s. 69 BNS***  
***STATE Vs. PARTH GUPTA***

***--3--***

records of Adhaar Card and Voter ID Card. He argued that initially the complainant created some fake mobile phone chats between her and applicant/accused but she did not handover her mobile phone to the IO for forensic examination. After order of the Court, the complainant reluctantly handed over her mobile phone to the IO, after deleting all data relating to chats.

4. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused referred to the copies of two different Adhaar Cards used by the complainant, with different names. In one of the Adhaar Cards, the name of complainant is mentioned as 'K' Bhatia D/o. Sh. Sanjeev Bhatia, R/o. Lajpat Nagar, South Delhi, New Delhi. As a Paytm user, the complainant uses her name as 'R' Bhatia.

5. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused has furnished the Adhaar Card record got updated by complainant over the years with UIDAI, Govt. of India, as per which, initially the complainant got issued her Adhaar Card on 05/02/2014 in the name of Ms. 'R' Bhatia W/o. Sh. Sanjeev Bhatia, R/o. Sangam Vihar, Deoli, New Delhi. Thereafter, complainant got updated her Adhaar Card several times. In Adhaar record updated on 18/05/2023, the name of complainant is mentioned as Ms. 'R' Bhatia W/o. Sh. Sanjeev Bhatia, R/o. Lajpat Nagar, Amar Colony, South Delhi, New Delhi.

***Contd..4.***

***Bail Matter 1734/2025***  
***FIR No. 329/2025***  
***PS AMAR COLONY***  
***U/s. 69 BNS***  
***STATE Vs. PARTH GUPTA***

***--4--***

6. In the latest update dated 04/03/2025, the complainant's identity is updated in Adhaar Card as Ms. 'R' Pathak D/o. Sh. Kum Kumar Pathak, R/o. Lajpat Nagar, South Delhi, New Delhi.

7. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused has furnished the documentary proof that in the PAN Card delivered to complainant on 27/07/2019, her name is mentioned as Ms. 'R' Bhatia. However, she has now got it updated as Ms. 'R' Pathak on 02/04/2025. The complainant has furnished her income tax returns for assessment years 2022-2023, 2023-2024 & 2024-2025 with name as Ms. 'R' Bhatia.

8. Similarly, IO has verified that complainant's Voter ID Card is in the name of Ms. 'R' Bhatia D/o. Sh. Sanjeev Bhatia, R/o. Lajpat Nagar, South Delhi, New Delhi. However, subsequently, the complainant has changed her name as Ms. 'R' Pathak, with her relative's name as Sanjeev Bhatia.

9. IO has reported that complainant has not provided sufficient information about her marriage with alleged Sanjeev Bhatia, who is father of her daughter. In her reply to IO, the complainant stated that in year 2010 she met a person namely Sanjeev Bhatia who used to work as a scrap dealer. Complainant gave birth to a minor daughter from Sanjeev Bhatia on 11/10/2011 in Rohini, Delhi. However, complainant got dissociated from Sanjeev Bhatia in November 2011 itself.

***Contd..5.***

***Bail Matter 1734/2025***  
***FIR No. 329/2025***  
***PS AMAR COLONY***  
***U/s. 69 BNS***  
***STATE Vs. PARTH GUPTA***

***--5--***

10. The complainant's statement/reply dated 01/07/2025 to the IO militated against her own identity cards that she had been using till year 2024, as per which she was wife of Sanjeev Bhatia and resided at Lajpat Nagar, South Delhi, New Delhi. The Adhaar record of complainant, that got updated on several occasions reflect that the complainant had changed her address for four times but on each occasion she got herself identified as 'wife of' or 'care of' Sanjeev Bhatia till 2024.

11. There is, indeed, a reasonable doubt about marital status of the complainant and her legal freedom to marry the applicant/accused. Anyhow, the Court has been informed that, in the meantime, IO has filed the charge-sheet after completing the investigation. The present case is not a case of forcible sexual assault. There is no report that applicant/accused failed to co-operate in investigation.

12. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the Court finds it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant / accused. The present application for grant of anticipatory bail is allowed, subject to condition that applicant/accused shall not attempt to contact, threaten or harm the complainant.

13. In the event of arrest, applicant/accused Parth Gupta shall be admitted to anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs.30,000/- with one surety of like amount, to the satisfaction of concerned Ld. JMFC/Ld. Duty JMFC.

***Contd..6.***

***Bail Matter 1734/2025***

***--6--***

***FIR No. 329/2025***

***PS AMAR COLONY***

***U/s. 69 BNS***

***STATE Vs. PARTH GUPTA***

The application is disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be given to IO.

Copy of this order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for  
applicant/accused, as prayed for.

**(VISHAL SINGH)**

**ASJ-05, South-East District**

**Saket Courts, New Delhi:10.09.2025**