



\$~59

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2605/2025 & CRL.M.A. 20316/2025**

TASLIMA @PUTTI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Suraj Prakash Sharma, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP.

SI Kartar Singh Rawat, Anti-Narcotics Cell.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

17.07.2025

%

1. The present application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (formerly Section 439 Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973¹) seeks grant of interim bail for a period of 30 days in FIR No. 444/2024 dated 4th June, 2024, registered under Section 21 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at P.S. Bhalswa Dairy. The said request is made on account of supposed illness of the Petitioner's daughter.

2. In this regard, the Petitioner had earlier approached the Sessions Court seeking interim bail, however, the said request was declined by way of order dated 10th July, 2025, which has also been impugned in the present petition. In the said order dated 10th July, 2025, the Sessions Court observed

¹ "Cr.P.C."



as follows:

“3.4 Today Ld. Counsel has filed copy of medical documents dated 09.07.2025 of Max Healthcare, Shalimar Bagh, however, there is no mention about the surgery and admission of patient. Only certain investigation tests and medication have been advised to the patient by the doctor. As per medical document dated 09.07.2025 the patient is under treatment since 31.12.2024. Meaning thereby, she is under treatment for more than six months but till date there is no occasion when she was admitted in the hospital or she had visited the hospital in any emergency. If daughter of accused/applicant is critically ill then she should have been admitted in any of the hospital, however, daughter of accused/applicant is not admitted in hospital till date for the reason best known to her. It is also matter of record that no surgery has been opined by the doctor till date. She is visiting a clinic where there is no facility of admission which is again reflection of the fact that no admission is required and she is visiting the doctor in OPD for consultation.”

[Emphasis supplied]

3. Thus, the Trial Court declined to grant interim bail to the Petitioner on the grounds that no supporting medical document was placed on record by him to show any urgent or critical health condition of his daughter. It was further observed that if the Petitioner’s daughter was indeed critically ill, she would likely have been admitted to a hospital, and there would have been some medical record indicating the necessity of surgery or in-patient care. In the absence of such material, the Trial Court found no justification for the grant of interim bail.

4. In the present application, even though the Petitioner has adduced medical documents of his daughter, the same do not indicate any emergent or critical need for her to be hospitalised or needing extensive medical treatment for which the Petitioner’s presence may be required. Therefore, this Court finds no ground to exercise its jurisdiction in the present petition.

5. However, it is clarified that in the event that the Petitioner is able to produce additional or updated medical records which substantiate the critical



nature of his daughter's illness or if there is any scheduled medical procedure which she has to go through for which the Petitioner's presence is needed, it shall be open to the Petitioner to move a fresh application before the Trial Court. If such an application is filed, it shall be considered on its own merits and in accordance with law.

6. Dismissed along with pending applications.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JULY 17, 2025

d.negi