



\$~10

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1736/2019**

X

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Mallika Parmar Advocate  
(DHCLSC)

versus

STATE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for  
the State with Ms. Amisha Dahiya,  
Advocate and Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sub  
Insp, P.S. Jyoti Nagar  
Mr. Rahul Rajeev and Mr. Azim  
Basheer, Advocates for R-2

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA**

**ORDER**

**19.11.2025**

%

1. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent no. 2 *vide* order dated 23.01.2019.
2. It is argued by the learned counsel that respondent no. 2 had beaten the victim/petitioner on the intervening night of 12/13.08.2020 and the petitioner had sustained grievous injuries. However, she does not dispute that a separate FIR in this regard already stands registered and the case is pending trial.
3. This Court takes note of the fact that when the present petition for



cancellation of bail was filed, the aforesaid incident had not taken place, and therefore, that could not have been a ground for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent no. 2.

4. This Court also takes note of the fact that anticipatory bail in this case was granted in the year 2019 itself and the other incident which has been pointed out was in the year 2020, regarding which a separate FIR was registered and chargesheet was filed.

5. This Court also takes note of the fact that the chargesheet in the present case was filed without arrest of the accused/respondent no. 2.

6. In the last order, this Court had observed that in case of any threats being extended by the accused or intimidation, the petitioner will be at liberty to approach the learned Chairman of the Witness Protection Committee (WPC) concerned in this case.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondent no. 2.

8. In view of above, the present petition stands disposed of.

9. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

**DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J**

**NOVEMBER 19, 2025/ns**

TD



\$~3

\*

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

+

BAIL APPLN. 3406/2025

MANJULA

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Shashi Kiran Senior Advocate  
with Mr. Rohit Pandey, Mr.  
Adhyayan Gupta, Ms. Ashtha  
Shrivastav, Ms. Aryama Dubey, Mr.  
Amit Kumar Mishra, Mr. Ipsit Pallav,  
Ms. Jyoti Dedha, Ms. Tannu Tyagi,  
Mr. Utkarsh Chauhan, Mr. Ajay  
Pratap Singh and Mr. Hridyesh Singh,  
Advocates

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA**

**ORDER**

**19.11.2025**

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 0209/2025, registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar, Delhi, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 20/29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereafter '*NDPS Act*').
2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 11.05.2025, a secret information, eventually recorded as DD No. 5A at AATS/SED, had been received regarding two persons transporting *ganja* in an auto-rickshaw in the Jal Vihar area, Lajpat Nagar, Delhi. A raid was conducted, whereafter



one Tarun and one Md. Usman had been apprehended from TSR No. DL1RQ6193 with two white plastic *kattas* containing a total of 22.670 kg of *ganja*. The said narcotic substance was seized, and the accused persons were arrested. During the course of investigation, the accused persons disclosed that they used to procure *ganja* from one Waseem, on the directions of one Arumugam, and from one Sikander, on the directions of applicant Manjula, after procuring the same, they used to deliver narcotic substances to Arumugam and Manjula. Co-accused Tarun also revealed the mobile number of the present applicant as 92\*\*\*\*\*29. Thereafter, a raid was conducted at the *jhuggi* of the applicant, however, the same was found to have been locked. The present applicant was eventually arrested on 15.05.2025 and at her instance, a mobile phone box bearing IMEI 86868407692576 was recovered from her *jhuggi*. The Call Detail Records (CDRs) analysis revealed that the mobile number allegedly used by the applicant, actually stood registered in the name of co-accused Tarun; however, the same was being operated from the mobile phone having the above-mentioned IMEI. During subsequent investigation, raids were also conducted on 27.08.2025 and 30.08.2025 at co-accused Arumugam's *jhuggi*; however, the same was found locked, and the said accused could not be located, despite issuance of NBWs and initiation of requisite proceedings under Section 84 of BNSS qua him. The chargesheet in the present case stands filed against the present accused.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that the only incriminating material against the applicant is the disclosure statement of the co-accused persons, which is inadmissible in law.



Moreover, it is submitted that bail cannot be denied to the applicant only on the basis of CDRs between the applicant and the co-accused persons. It is contended that since the chargesheet now stands filed against the applicant, her further custody is unwarranted and therefore, she be granted regular bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State argues that the allegations against the present applicant are serious in nature, and that the applicant herein was actively involved in the supply of the narcotic substance in connivance with co-accused persons. It is contended that at the applicant's instance, a mobile phone box linked to the IMEI used with the relevant SIM was recovered from the applicant's *jhuggi*. Additionally, it is submitted that the CDR analysis establishes her regular communication with the co-accused persons, Tarun and Arumugam. The learned APP also submits that commercial quantity of *ganja* was recovered from the co-accused Tarun, in whose name the SIM card used by the applicant is actually registered. Therefore, it is prayed that the present application be rejected.

5. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State and has also perused the material available on record.

6. In the present case, this Court finds that there has been a recovery of 22.670 kg of *ganja* from the possession of co-accused persons Tarun and Md. Usman, which constitutes commercial quantity under the NDPS Act. The role attributed to the present applicant is that she was allegedly distributing the narcotic substances, procured by the said co-accused persons on her directions.



7. It is not in dispute that the name of the present applicant surfaced in the disclosure statements of the co-accused persons; however, during the course of investigation, the applicant was arrested and, at her instance, a mobile phone box bearing IMEI No. 86868407692576 was recovered from her *jhuggi*. The CAF details of Mobile No. 92\*\*\*\*\*29\*, allegedly used by the applicant, revealed that the said mobile number was registered in the name of co-accused Tarun, from whom recovery of commercial quantity of ganja was effected. Although the mobile handset itself could not be recovered, it was found that the aforesaid mobile number was being operated from a handset having the same IMEI number as that on the box recovered from the applicant's *jhuggi*. Further, the CDR analysis of the said mobile number reflected regular and repeated contact between the present applicant and co-accused persons Tarun and Arumugam. These facts, emerging from the investigation, taken together, *prima facie* indicate the applicant's nexus and involvement with the co-accused persons in connection with the alleged offences.

8. In this backdrop, this Court also notes that, as pointed out by the learned APP for the State, co-accused Arumugam – with whom the applicant shares CDR connectivity – is still absconding.

9. Considering the above circumstances, including the recovery of commercial quantity from co-accused persons, the recovery of the mobile phone box linking her to the IMEI used with the relevant mobile number, the CDR connectivity showing regular contact with co-accused persons including an absconding accused, and the stage of the case where prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined, this Court is of the view that



no ground for grant of regular bail is made out.

10. The bail application is accordingly dismissed.

11. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

**DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J**

**NOVEMBER 19, 2025/ns**

VS



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3737/2025**

**DEVKI**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Kaushik Mr. Akash  
Kasana, Ms. Deepika Vashistha, Ms.  
Himanshi Sharma and Mr. Bhuvil  
Choudhary, Advocates

versus

**STATE OF NCT OF DELHI**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA**

**ORDER**  
**19.11.2025**

%

1. By way of present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out FIR bearing no. 121/2024, registered on 20.02.2024 at Police Station Begumpur (Rohini), Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Section 370(4)/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC') and Section 81 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (hereafter 'JJ Act').

2. Brief facts of the case are that a PCR call *vide* DD No. 74A dated 20.02.2024 was received at P.S. Begumpur regarding alleged trafficking of children and noise of weeping from a neighbour's house. On the statement of the complainant Laxmi Mehta, the present FIR was registered. The complainant stated that in the opposite house, two women, a man and two children were residing, and that she had often seen them with different



newborn babies of about 20–25 days, despite none of the women being pregnant, which aroused suspicion. On 20.02.2024 she heard the cries of a child and also overheard a girl talking on the phone mentioning “5.80 or 4.80,” while the child continued crying. She, along with the landlord and neighbours, went upstairs to enquire, where the women gave evasive replies. Thereafter, she called the police, who upon arrival questioned the women, who disclosed their names as co-accused Priya and present applicant/accused Devki, and further revealed that they were engaged in the business of buying and selling children alongwith co-accused Sangram.

3. As per status report, during investigation, a newborn girl child of about 10-20 days was found in the custody of co-accused Priya and the applicant herein, both residents of Begumpur, Delhi. They were arrested, and during interrogation, disclosed that they had been engaged in trafficking of newborn babies for the past 3-4 years with the help of co-accused Rajinder and Simranjeet Kaur, who used to supply babies from Punjab for further sale. Subsequently, the other co-accused persons i.e., Rajinder, Piyush Aggarwal, Simranjeet Kaur, Raman, Pooja, Binder Kaur and Paramjeet @ Pamma were also arrested. Co-accused Sangram however could not be arrested and proceedings against him under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. were initiated.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant/accused argues that the applicant/accused has clean antecedents and has no previous involvement in any criminal case. It is further argued that the applicant/accused has been in judicial custody for about two years. It is argued that there is no evidence to connect the present applicant/accused with co-accused persons, and that



there is no CCTV footage to substantiate the prosecution's case. It is further argued that the applicant, an aged lady, has been falsely implicated in the present case. On these grounds, it is prayed that the applicant herein be granted regular bail.

5. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the present bail application, and argues that the applicant is a key participant in an organised racket engaged in the buying and selling of infants. The specific role attributed to the applicant/accused is that she used to keep and handle the infants until a suitable purchaser was identified. It is further argued that when the police had reached the spot pursuant to the receipt of complaint, an infant aged about 10–20 days was recovered from the possession of the applicant. It is also argued that the Call Detail Records reveal that the applicant was in constant contact with the co-accused persons. It is further argued that only one prosecution witness has been partly examined so far, and thus, at this stage, the applicant be not granted regular bail.

6. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant as well as the State, and has also perused the material available on record.

7. In the present case, this Court notes that the present applicant/accused, along with the co-accused persons, was allegedly a part of an organised racket engaged in the procurement and sale of newborn children for monetary gain. A total of 10 persons came to be arrested in the course of investigation. As alleged, the roles of all accused persons were defined: Binder Kaur (a nurse/midwife) ran a clinic in Abhor, Punjab, and is alleged to have approached pregnant women/parents of new-borns from poor financial backgrounds; Simranjeet Kaur and Rajinder posed as a childless,



well-settled husband-and-wife couple who purportedly sought to adopt newborn babies; other accused (Raman, Pooja, Priya, applicant Devki, Sangram, Piyush and Paramjeet) played complementary roles, such as procuring signatures on blank notary/stamp papers, receiving custody of children, transporting the children and effecting sales to buyers in and outside the State.

8. The role attributed to the present applicant/accused is that she, along with others, would meet the co-accused Simran and Rajinder in Hisar, where newborn children were allegedly handed over to her. Allegedly, the applicant used to take care of the infants until a prospective buyer offering a suitable amount was identified, after which she would purportedly receive her share of the proceeds.

9. This Court also notes that upon receiving the complaint made by Ms. Laxmi Mehta, the police had reached the spot and recovered a newborn female child, about 10–20 days old, from the possession of the present applicant Devki and co-accused Priya. It is also pertinent to note that the applicant herein was present at the spot at the time of the recovery. Furthermore, the analysis of the Call Detail Records also revealed that the applicant herein was in constant telephonic contact with the co-accused persons. Most importantly, the prosecution alleges that the children so procured were advertised and offered to prospective buyers by means of WhatsApp video calls/chats and photographs, with bidding and monetary negotiations, the ultimate object being sale to the highest bidder, rather than any legitimate adoption process.

10. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case,



the seriousness of the allegations, coupled with the fact that the infant of about 10-20 days was found in the possession of the applicant at the time of the incident, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant/accused.

11. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.

12. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

13. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith

**DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J**

**NOVEMBER 19, 2025/ns/td**



\$~93

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 8174/2025**

**SUMIT KUMAR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Counsel (appearance not given)

versus

**THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State with  
SI Vikram Singh, PS: Welcome.  
Mr. Chetan, Advocate for R-2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA**

**ORDER**  
**19.11.2025**

%

**CRL.M.C. 8174/2025**

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking cancellation of the bail granted to respondent no. 2 *vide* order dated 11.11.2025, passed by the learned Additional and Sessions Judge-07, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 126/2024, registered at Police Station Welcome, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 302/307/341/323/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter '*IPC*') and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959.
2. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State and seeks time to file Status Report. Let the same be filed, at least two days prior to the next date of hearing.
3. Issue notice. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent



no. 2 accepts notice and seeks time to file a reply. Let the same be filed, at least two days prior to the next date of hearing.

4. List on 11.12.2025.

**CRL.M.A. 34153/2025**

5. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking issuance of direction to the learned Trial Court to refrain from relying upon the impugned order dated 11.11.2025.

6. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.

7. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the impugned order had not appreciated the latest law regarding non-furnishing of grounds of arrest, and had granted bail to respondent no. 2 casually, and without considering the seriousness of the offence where the victim had been murdered. He further states that the applications of the other co-accused persons are also coming up before the learned Trial Court for arguments and the learned Trial Court may be directed not to rely on its previous order dated 11.11.2025, and pass the judgment as per law.

8. This Court after hearing arguments addressed on behalf of the learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State, is of the opinion that since the impugned order is *sub judice* and under consideration of this Court, the bail applications of the other co-accused persons, be decided as per law and the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court regarding furnishing or non-furnishing of grounds of arrest, without being influenced by its previous orders. In any case, every bail application has to be heard on its own merits and the learned Trial Court is expected to do so.

9. Accordingly, the present application is disposed of with above directions.



10. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

**DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J**

**NOVEMBER 19, 2025/vc**  
**TD**