



2025:DHC:2042



\$~3

\*

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

%

*Date of Decision: 27.03.2025*

+

**BAIL APPLN. 2344/2024**

SEEMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas Kr. Gautam and Mr.  
Devansh Gupta, Advocates

versus

THE STATE OF NCT DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State  
with SI Nagendra Kumar, Anti  
Narcotics Squad, South East**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 224/2024 of Police Station Govindpuri for offences under Sections 20(ii)(C) and Section 29 of NDPS Act.

2. Perusal of record reflects that the petitioner was granted protection from arrest and was repeatedly directed to join investigation but repeatedly she defaulted. After 7 dates of hearing, on the last date the predecessor bench directed her personal appearance in Court. Accordingly, today petitioner has appeared.

3. On being asked as to why the anticipatory bail be not declined on account of petitioner not joining investigation all this while, learned counsel for the petitioner stated that since petitioner was ill, she did not join.

*BAIL APPLN. 2344/2024**Page 1 of 2 pages*

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed  
By: NEETU N NAIR  
Signing Date: 27.03.2025  
19:11:17



2025:DHC:2042



However, the petitioner, on being asked in Hindi stated that she has always reported at the Police Station, whenever called.

4. Learned Prosecutor on instructions from the Investigating Officer/SI Nagendra Kumar clarified that on some of the dates, petitioner joined investigation but remains evasive and has also not given any reply to notice dated 18.10.2024 under Section 94 BNSS. Copy of the notice dated 18.10.2024 is a part of the status report filed by the State. Therefore, the anticipatory bail application is opposed by the State.

5. A perusal of previous orders of this Court starting from 09.07.2024 reflects repeated adjournments, directing the petitioner to join investigation. The offences charged against the petitioner are serious in nature. Even the notice dated 18.10.2024 specifically enlists the intimation which is in exclusive possession of petitioner, but she is not disclosing the same and not even handing over her mobile phones, SIM cards, PAN cards and other details in order to carry out further investigation.

6. Considering these circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the application is dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**MARCH 27, 2025/rs**

*BAIL APPLN. 2344/2024*

*Page 2 of 2 pages*