



\$~64

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2357/2025**

RAGINI KUMARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. N. Hariharan, Senior Advocate,
Mr. Akshat Shandilya, Ms. Sangeeta
Tyagi, Mr. Jatin, Mr. T.N. Tyagi, Mr.
Gaurav Singh and Mr. Narender
Kumar, Advocates

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State
with SI Mahendra Yadav, P.S. V K
South

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **07.07.2025**

CRL.M.A. 18763/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 2357/2025

3. By way of the instant application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No. 113/2024, registered at Police Station Vasant Kunj, South-West District, New Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC').
4. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.
5. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that a complaint was



lodged by one Ms. Neelam Agrahari with the Police Station Vasant Kunj South, Delhi alleging therein that in the year 2016, she had purchased a property bearing Flat No. 2, Upper Ground Floor, Plot No. B-329 Khasra No. 1040, Vasant Kunj Enclave, New Delhi from the present applicant Ragini Kumari and Murari Kumar Singh and the Agreement to Sell of above property of amount of Rs. 15 lacs (according to Agreement to Sell) was executed between them on 01.09.2016. Further, she alleged that the amount of Rs. 15 lacs, she had paid Rs. 48 lacs to alleged Murari Kumar Singh in various instalments regarding this deal. But both the alleged persons neither had given the possession of said property nor had refunded the money.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the present applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is stated that the complainant has failed to explain the occurrence of offence as per mandatory of Section 154 of Cr.P.C. It is argued that the allegations levelled against the present applicant are without any documentary evidence. It is stated that the applicant herein has denied the receiving of alleged amount of Rs. 63,50,000/- from the complainant at any point of time. It is further argued that the present FIR is the counterblast to the complaint case filed by the husband of the applicant herein before the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Dwarka on 03.05.2023. It is therefore prayed that the applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

7. On the other hand, learned APP for the State concedes that the present applicant has joined the investigation, and has no objection if the present applicant is granted anticipatory bail.

8. This Court has heard arguments addressed on behalf of both the parties, and has perused the material available on record.



9. After hearing the arguments advanced by both parties and perusing the case file, this Court takes note of the fact that the offence in question arises out of a property transaction that allegedly took place in the year 2016. However, it is admitted that the complainant had approached the police and lodged the present FIR only in the year 2024, after a considerable lapse of nearly eight years. Such an unexplained delay in lodging the complaint is a material circumstance that cannot be ignored, particularly when the dispute pertains to a transaction involving immovable property, which is often susceptible to civil litigation.

10. This Court further notes that the applicant has already joined the investigation on at least fifteen prior occasions and has cooperated with the Investigating Officer as and when called upon to do so. There is no allegation by the Investigating Agency that the applicant has either evaded investigation or failed to assist in the inquiry. The record also reveals that the FSL report, which is a crucial piece of evidence in the present case, pertains to the co-accused, namely, the husband of the applicant, and not to the applicant herself. The applicant's specimen signatures have already been obtained by the Investigating Officer during the course of the investigation, and the prosecution has not pointed out any requirement for custodial interrogation of the applicant at this stage for the purposes of comparison or further evidence collection.

11. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant, and in event of arrest, the applicant shall be released on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/I.O concerned on the following terms and conditions:



- i) The applicant shall remain available on mobile numbers; shared by him with the Police.
 - ii) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court.
 - iii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make an attempt to influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
 - iv) In case of change of residential address/contact details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned I.O/SHO.
12. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.
13. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed herein above shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.
14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JULY 07, 2025/ns

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)