



\$~9

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2512/2025**

NARINDER KAUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar & Mr. Manoj
Kumar, Advocates

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Aman Usman, APP with SI Ram
Lal, PS Moti Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

11.08.2025

%

1. This is an application under Section 482 BNSS for the grant of anticipatory bail, filed on behalf of applicant Narender Kaur in case FIR No. 199/2025, under Section 318(3) BNS, 2023, PS Moti Nagar.
2. Learned APP files the Status Report, which is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel, appearing for the applicant, submits that complainant and applicant are known to each other, being neighbours. Complainant approached the applicant and expressed her desire to arrange some loan to her against her gold ornaments. Applicant only advised her to take loan by pledging the gold jewellery with Muthoot Finance.
4. It has been further submitted that complainant did not want that her husband should get to know about her taking the loan, and for this reason, she offered to pay commission to the applicant to help her getting the loan.



5. It is submitted that applicant took the complainant to the office of Muthoot Finance, Kirti Nagar, where complainant pledged her jewellery on 30.07.2024 and an amount of Rs. 86,270/- was transferred in the account of the applicant, and thereafter, applicant gave the said amount in cash to the complainant.

6. Complainant again pledged more jewellery with Muthoot Finance on 27.08.2024 against loan of Rs. 3,19,770/-, which amount was transferred to the account of the applicant. Later on, the applicant transferred an amount of Rs. 20,000/- in the account of her son, who withdrew the same from the ATM. Further, an amount of Rs. 31,000/- was also transferred by the applicant in the name of her son. Such amount was withdrawn from the account of the son of the applicant and a total sum of Rs. 1 lakh was given in cash to the complainant on the same day. Applicant further transferred Rs. 49,500/- in the account of her son and on 28.08.2024, withdrew the same through ATM and paid Rs. 1 lakh to the complainant on 28.08.2024. She made payment of Rs. 1 lakh to the complainant on 29.08.2024 by borrowing the same from her son.

7. It has been further submitted that applicant has joined the investigation on 12.03.2025, 18.06.2025, 19.06.2025 & 23.06.2025 and is therefore not required for further interrogation.

8. Applicant is stated to be having clean antecedents and not involved in any other criminal case. Applicant is ready to comply with any condition imposed by the Court.

9. Bail application has been opposed by the learned APP, submitting that there is apprehension that in case applicant is granted bail, she may flee from the course of justice. There is also likelihood that she may influence



the witnesses. Her custodial interrogation is required to recover the gold jewellery. It is also submitted that even though, applicant joined investigation, but she did not cooperate. On merits, it is submitted that the total amount deposited by Muthoot Finance in the account of the applicant as per the entries in the bank statement of the applicant is to the tune of Rs. 11,61,249/-.

10. As per allegations, applicant hypnotized the complainant and induced her to deliver gold jewellery, which was pledged by the applicant with Muthoot Finance to avail the loan.

11. Status Report reveals that the amount given in lieu of the loan from Muthoot Finance used to go to the bank account of the applicant and she used to transfer all the money online in various accounts.

12. Status Report further reveals that applicant had sent the screen-shots of Muthoot Finance's slips to sell some jewellery to a jeweller namely Sanjeev Kumar @ Shanti. Later, the same Muthoot Finance's slips were shown to the complainant, and on seeing the same, complainant stated that she is the owner of the said jewellery.

13. During investigation, transaction details of the complainant's bank account have been obtained, which show that there was no transaction of money from the account of the applicant to the complainant's account.

14. The Investigating Officer requires the custody of the applicant for the recovery of alleged gold jewellery articles. The allegations against the applicant are grave and serious in nature. The trial court has already issued NBWs against the applicant.

15. Hence, considering the entire facts and circumstances as also the nature and gravity of allegations, coupled with the fact that applicant is



required for custodial investigation, in the opinion of the Court, it is not a fit case for grant of pre-arrest bail.

16. The application is therefore dismissed.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.

AUGUST 11, 2025

RM