



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

CNR No. DLHC010191022026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1696/2026**

SOBTI KOMAL

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Ramesh Gupta, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, Mr. Satish
Verma, Advs.

Versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for the
State with SI Santosh, Tilak Marg
Mr. Manmeet Singh Arora, Mr.
Jasman Singh Sethi and Ms.
Jahanvi Kapoor, Advs. for
complainant alongwith complainant
in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

20.08.2026

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 482* read with *Section 528* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in proceedings arising out of FIR No.8/2026 dated 27.01.2026 registered at PS.: Tilak Marg under *Sections 318(4)/316(2)/61(2)* of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. As per FIR, the complainant, a proprietor of M/s. Devi Sahai Charan Dass Retail, is a long-standing Del Credre Agent for Reliance Industries Ltd. and M/s. Alok Industries Ltd., who was facilitating sales,



deliveries, credit monitoring and payment realization for wholesalers and traders. In April 2025, co-accused Amit Arora, proprietor of M/s. Jasper Enterprises and the present applicant, who stated herself to be the business head therein, approached the complainant and projected themselves as established traders dealing in fabric, gifting articles and other items. In order to gain the complainant's trust, they initially made partial payments, however, between May 2025 and September 2025, against a payment of Rs.72,72,949/-, they bought goods worth approximately Rs.2,34,42,410/- from the complainant. Eventually, from August 2025 onwards, they deliberately avoided contacting with the complainant and on verification of their personal as well as Firm address revealed it to be incorrect or abandoned.

3. During investigation, co-accused Amit Arora was arrested from Una, Himachal Pradesh on 31.03.2026, at which time, the present applicant was also present alongwith him. Thereafter, Notice under *Section 35(3)* of the BNSS was served upon the present applicant, however, she failed to join investigation. Her application seeking grant of anticipatory bail then came to be dismissed by the learned Trial Court on 22.04.2026. Thereafter, though another Notice under *Section 35(3)* of the BNSS was served upon her to join investigation on 04.05.2026, but she did not join.

4. However, this Court *vide* order dated 07.05.2026, in view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant, directed the applicant to join and participate in the investigation before the concerned IO on 08.05.2026 at 04:00 PM at PS.: Tilak Marg, however, once again, she did not join therein. The aforesaid lead to issuance of Non-Bailable



Warrants (**NBWs**) by the learned Trial Court *vide* order dated 19.05.2026 against the present applicant.

5. Thence, the applicant approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of an SLP, wherein *vide* order dated 26.05.2026, she was directed to join investigation on 01.06.2026 at 04.00 PM at PS.: Tilak Marg. As such, *vide* order dated 01.06.2026, the learned Trial Court stayed the execution of the NBWs issued against the present applicant for a period of one day.

6. Pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the applicant appeared for interrogation before the concerned IO on 01.06.2026. However, the stay granted on execution of the NBWs was subsequently vacated by the learned Trial Court *vide* order dated 02.06.2026.

7. In this factual backdrop, this Court has heard learned counsel for the applicant as also the learned APP, and gone through the materials on record as also the judgments cited.

8. As borne out, though the present applicant joined investigation on 01.06.2026 at 04.00 PM at PS.: Tilak Marg pursuant to the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court *vide* order dated 26.05.2026, however, as per the Status Report, her conduct before the concerned IO has been evasive and incorporative. Interestingly, the overall conduct of the applicant has not been satisfactory as barring the aforesaid participation on 01.06.2026, she failed to join investigation on as many as three prior occasions and ever since vacation of the stay on the NBWs *vide* order dated 02.06.2026 by the learned Trial Court also, she is untraceable. These demonstrate a pre-planned, consistent and deliberate pattern of



evading the due process of law, even after obtaining interim protection(s) from the Court(s) of law on numerous occasions.

9. In such a scenario, learned senior counsel for the applicant cannot take benefit of the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Shally Mhant vs. State of Punjab: MANU/SCOR/2846/2026*** and ***Santosh vs. State of Maharashtra: MANU/SC/1313/2017*** and by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Mohd Kamran vs. State of NCT of Delhi: MANU/DEOR/90525/2025***, cited by him.

10. In any event, since the proceedings herein arising out of economic offences/ crimes entailing large-scale fraud, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Serious Fraud Investigation Office vs. Aditya Sarda: 2025 SCC OnLine SC 764***; ***P. Chidambaram vs. Directorate of Enforcement: (2019) 9 SCC 24*** and ***Srikant Upadhyay & Ors. vs. State of Bihar & Anr.: (2024) SCC OnLine SC 282***, they constitute a different class themselves, and therefore the discretion while granting anticipatory bail ought to be exercised sparingly, with care and caution.

11. Therefore, taking a note of the overall facts and circumstances involved herein, especially since the applicant has been explicitly named in the FIR wherein an active role has been assigned to her all throughout, her overall evasive conduct over a period of time, the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to her at this stage. Details *qua* the money trail, the bank account(s), the whereabouts thereof, the persons involved to unearth the overall nexus *inter se* everything with her and any other potential involvement may require her custodial interrogation.

12. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.



13. Needless to say, expression of view(s) on the merits, if any, are solely for the purposes of adjudication of the present application and shall have no bearing on the overall case/ trial involved.

AUGUST 20, 2026/So/DA

SAURABH BANERJEE, J