



\$~9

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1078/2026**

SAVITA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay K Singh, Advocate.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **28.04.2026**

CRL.M.A. 8105/2026 (exemption)

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

BAIL APPLN. 1078/2026

3. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 538/2025, registered at Police Station Shalimar Bagh, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 306/317(2)/238/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS').
4. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 26.09.2025, a complaint was lodged by the complainant, Mr. Rohit Gurnani, at Police Station Shalimar Bagh, alleging theft of valuable jewellery from his residence by his caretaker, Savita. During investigation, the present accused/applicant Savita was apprehended, and certain jewellery was



recovered from her possession and deposited in the *malkhana*. In her disclosure statement, she allegedly stated that she had sold the remaining stolen jewellery to Pradeep Kumar, owner of Bhagwati Jewellers. During further investigation, Pradeep Kumar and co-accused Laxman (husband of Savita) were interrogated. Pradeep Kumar allegedly admitted that he had purchased about 192 grams of gold from the applicant, which he had melted and sold. The complainant later informed the Investigating Officer (I.O.) that certain diamonds and stones, which could not be melted, were lying at Pradeep Kumar's residence, and also submitted a voice recording in which Pradeep Kumar was allegedly heard asking his son to return the remaining diamonds and stones. Acting on this information, the I.O. conducted a search at the residence of Pradeep Kumar, where four packets containing diamonds and stones were recovered from his cupboard and identified by the complainant. The recovery proceedings were videographed through the E-Sakshya App. During the recovery, Pradeep Kumar allegedly created obstruction with the help of his family members and fled from the spot, and CCTV footage of his escape was secured. Further investigation also revealed that applicant Savita and her associate, Bablu @ Laxman, had sold stolen jewellery to the sons of Pradeep Kumar, namely Adarsh (Adesh) and Keshav. A pen drive containing a recorded conversation between the complainant and Adarsh was also obtained, wherein Adarsh allegedly admitted possession of stolen jewellery.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is stated that she has no previous criminal antecedents, and has already remained in judicial custody for more than two months. It is also contended that the investigation



stands concluded and the co-accused persons in the case have already been granted bail by the learned Trial Court and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Thus, it is prayed that the applicant be released on regular bail.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the present bail application, contending that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. It is submitted that the applicant is specifically alleged to have stolen a substantial quantity of jewellery from a house where she was placed in a position of trust. It is, therefore, prayed that the present bail application be dismissed.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments on behalf of the applicant as well as the State and has perused the material on record.

8. Having considered the rival submissions and perused the material on record, this Court notes that the investigation in the present case stands concluded and the charge sheet has already been filed. Thus, the continued incarceration of the applicant is no longer necessary for the purposes of investigation. It is also an admitted position that the co-accused persons in the present case have already been granted bail by the learned Trial Court. Further, it is undisputed that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents and that her involvement is confined to the present case.

9. This Court further notes that the applicant/ accused is a permanent resident of Delhi and her residential address has been duly verified by the Investigating Officer.

10. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, including the period of custody already undergone by the applicant, the absence of any criminal antecedents, and the fact that the trial is likely to



take considerable time to conclude, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned on the following terms and conditions:

- i) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court and if she has passport, she shall surrender the same to the concerned trial court.
 - ii) The applicant shall share her contact details (mobile numbers and residential address) with the IO/SHO and the Trial Court; and in case of any change in the said details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court and the concerned IO/SHO.
 - iii) The applicant shall appear before the Trial Court on every date of hearing unless exempted;
 - iv) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal activity;
 - v) The applicant shall not communicate with, or come into contact with the complainant or any of the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence of the case.
11. The bail applications is accordingly disposed of.
 12. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
 13. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

APRIL 28, 2026/vc/AP