



\$~2

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

CNR No. DLHC010196572026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1730/2026**

MEENU

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Raghav Gupta & Mr. Amit
Kumar, Advocates.**

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP
with Mr. Narendra Kumar,
Advocate.
SI Mukesh Yadav, P.S. Punjabi
Bagh.
Complainant in Person.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **18.08.2026**

1. By way of the present application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"], the petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with FIR No. 20/2026 dated 17.01.2026, registered at Police Station Punjabi Bagh, under Sections 305/331(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ["BNS"] ["subject FIR"].

2. I have heard Mr. Raghav Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State. Pursuant to the order dated 05.05.2026, the complainant has been duly served and is present in person. He supports



the submissions advanced by Mr. Chauhan.

3. Mr. Chauhan has also filed a status report, which is already on record.

4. The prosecution case, as it emerges from the material on record, is that the FIR was registered in relation to a burglary committed during the intervening night of 16.01.2026 and 17.01.2026 at the complainant's residence, during which gold jewellery, silver articles and cash were stolen. CCTV footage revealed two persons, with their faces covered, entering the complainant's house after cutting the window grill, and committing the theft. Their subsequent movements were traced with the assistance of the CCTV footage and, on the basis of secret information, they were identified as Shankar Lal and Manish, both residents of B-1/27, Ground Floor, Vishnu Garden, New Delhi.

5. The present petitioner is the wife of Shankar Lal. During interrogation, she disclosed that, in the early hours of 17.01.2026, Shankar Lal and Manish had returned home carrying a bag containing the stolen property. Pursuant thereto, part of the stolen property, comprising 216.60 grams of gold, 3270.17 grams of silver articles and Rs. 80,499/- in cash, was recovered from the said residence and seized. Mr. Chauhan submits that the recovered property has since been released to the complainant on *superdari*. It is further stated that Manish was identified and apprehended at the instance of the petitioner, and 216.60 grams of stolen gold jewellery was recovered from his possession. The recovered jewellery was subsequently correctly identified during a judicial Test Identification Parade ["TIP"].

6. The petitioner was arrested on 18.01.2026, while Manish was



arrested on 21.01.2026.

7. Mr. Gupta submits that, even according to the prosecution, the petitioner was not an active participant in the commission of the burglary, and is alleged only to have been in conscious possession of a part of the stolen property. He submits that the articles recovered from her residence had been brought there by her husband, Shankar Lal, who is alleged to have actively participated in the burglary. Mr. Gupta further submits that the petitioner has cooperated with the investigation and that the stolen property left at her residence by her husband and nephew was recovered at her instance. He also points out that Manish was identified and apprehended at her instance. Since the charge-sheet has already been filed, he submits that the petitioner's further incarceration during the pendency of the trial is not warranted.

8. Mr. Chauhan, on the other hand, relies upon the status report to submit that the petitioner was in conscious possession of part of the stolen property. He further submits that a substantial portion of the stolen property is yet to be recovered and that the petitioner's husband, Shankar Lal, is also yet to be apprehended.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considered the material on record, I am of the view that the present case is a fit case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

10. The petitioner is not alleged to have participated in the commission of the burglary, and the recovery attributed to her is from the residence shared by her with her husband, who is alleged to be the principal perpetrator and is presently absconding. The status report further indicates that the petitioner identified the stolen articles which had



allegedly been left at the residence by her husband and also identified the co-accused Manish, who has since been arrested.

11. The charge-sheet has already been filed. Although the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined, having regard to the role attributed to the petitioner, her identification is not dependent upon the testimony of the complainant or any other eye-witness.

12. It is also undisputed that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

13. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail in connection with the subject FIR, upon furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, and subject to the following conditions:

- a) The petitioner shall appear before the learned Trial Court on each and every date of hearing;
- b) The petitioner shall furnish her permanent address, as well as the address at which she resides during the pendency of the proceedings, to the learned Trial Court. In the event of any change in her residential address, she shall intimate the Investigating Officer and file an affidavit to that effect before the learned Trial Court;
- c) The petitioner shall furnish her mobile number to the Investigating Officer/Station House Officer, which shall be kept operational at all times. She shall neither switch off the said mobile number nor change the same without prior intimation to the Investigating Officer during the pendency of the trial;
- d) The petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case,



or tamper with the evidence in any manner whatsoever;

- e) The petitioner shall not leave the country without the prior permission of the learned Trial Court;
- f) The petitioner shall not commit any offence during the period of her release on bail.

14. The bail application, alongwith any pending applications, is disposed of in terms of the above.

15. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail application, and shall neither influence the trial proceedings, nor be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

16. Copy of the order be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent electronically for information and necessary compliance.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 18, 2026

'pv'/SM/SD/