

\$~4

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 1090/2016

NEELAM SURI Petitioner

Through Mr.A.K. Dhupar, Adv.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI Respondent

Through Mr.Rajat Katyal, APP for the State.
SI Manish Kumar, PS Shalimar Bagh.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.TEJI

ORDER

%

31.05.2016

Arguments heard.

The present bail application under Section 439 read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, has been preferred by the petitioner against the order dated 11th April, 2016 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-04, North-West, Rohini Courts, Delhi while dismissing the bail application of the petitioner in a case arising out of FIR No.933/2015 under Section 420/406/34 Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Shalimar Bagh.

As per FIR, the allegations levelled are that the complainant, Ms.Renu Chaudhary, came to know three years back that a lady

namely Ms.Neelam Suri-the petitioner herein, used to provide benefit to the public by doubling their invested amount, reached the applicant where the applicant introduced her with three-four ladies and apprised them about the scheme. In pursuance thereof, the complainant decided to invest money in the scheme and since May, 2012 till the date of the complaint. She had invested Rs.9,50,000/- with Neelam Suri and Madhu Nanda Group. Thereafter, as per the version of the complainant, she came to know that the petitioner along with her group members was planning to escape and misappropriate the money invested. Thereafter, all efforts to contact the petitioner and her group when in vain and even the mobile phones of the petitioner and her associates were switched off.

During the course of arguments, it has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the above said case as the petitioner has already paid some amount to the members and only a few members are left to be paid by them. Besides this, some members dishonestly demanded exaggerated amount upto three-four times of their actual instalments paid and a few of them have already taken their committee amount but were still demanding money by blackmailing her. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is no likelihood of the petitioner absconding or tampering with the evidence of the prosecution as the petitioner is having roots in the society and her daughters are residing in Delhi. It is further stated that the supplementary challan against the petitioner has been filed and the petitioner is attending the trial of the case before the learned

Metropolitan Magistrate and as such, she is no more required for the purpose of investigation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the co-accused have either been granted anticipatory bail from this Court or regular bail and the co-accused Smt.Hemlata has already been admitted to regular bail from the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge.

In the facts and circumstances mentioned and on the ground of parity, the petitioner is admitted to bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with two sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court. However, the petitioner is directed not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court concerned and shall not tamper with the evidence and influence the prosecution witnesses.

The present application is accordingly allowed.

P.S.TEJI, J

MAY 31, 2016/aa