



\$~2

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 600/2024**

VINEETA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anoop Kumar, Mr. Dinesh Kumar Sharma, Mr. Jai Subhash Thakur, Mr. Krishan Shokeen, Advocates

versus

THE STATE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the State
SI Krishan Kumar, PS: Bawana.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

31.07.2025

1. The present application for pre-arrest bail filed by the Applicant, in relation to FIR No. 497/2016 dated 21st November, 2016, registered at P.S. Bawana, was being considered alongside the bail application of her sister, Sunaina (BAIL APPLN. No. 602/2024). On 19th February, 2024, the Applicant was directed to join investigation and afforded interim protection against coercive action. In compliance thereof, the Applicant joined investigation.

2. However, the interim protection was subsequently withdrawn on 11th December, 2024, following the receipt of the FSL report, which *prima facie* indicated that the signatures of the complainant on the affidavit, filed on her



behalf in the petition (bearing no. CRL. M.C. 4987/2028) for quashing of FIR No. 497/2016, were forged. The Court had further directed the matter to be heard on 10th March, 2025, at request of counsel for the Applicant. However, on account of non-appearance on the said date on the part of the Applicant, the matter was dismissed. Thereafter, on an application [CRL. MA. No. 8387/2025] moved by the Applicant, the instant bail petition was restored to its original number.

3. Counsel for the Applicant has pointed out that the FSL report, pertains to the co-accused, Sunaina, who is alleged to have submitted the forged affidavit of the complainant in the quashing petition before this Court, in CRL. M.C. No. 4987/2018 titled ***Sunaina v. State & Anr.*** Since the Applicant was not a party to the quashing petition, the FSL report cannot implicate the Applicant.

4. It is well established through catena of judgments by the Supreme Court that the object of granting bail is neither punitive nor preventative. The primary aim sought to be achieved by bail is to secure the attendance of the accused person at the trial.¹

5. The Applicant has been cooperating in investigation and was *prima facie* not involved in the forgery of the affidavit of the complainant. Having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, and the role assigned to the Applicant, the application is allowed. In the event of arrest, the Applicant be released on bail on furnishing a bail bond for a sum of INR 25,000/- with one surety of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of the concerned SHO, on the following conditions:

¹ See also: ***Sanjay Chandra v. CBI***, (2012) 1 SCC 40; ***Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation***, (2022) 10 SCC 51.



- a. The Applicant shall join and cooperate with the investigation as and when directed by the IO;
- b. The Applicant shall not leave the boundaries of the country without informing the IO/ SHO concerned;
- c. The Applicant shall not contact the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner;
- d. The Applicant shall give his mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switched on at all times;
6. In the event of there being any FIR / DD entry / complaint lodged against the Applicant, it would be open to the State to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.
7. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and should not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8. The application is allowed in the afore-mentioned terms.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JULY 31, 2025

d.negi