



\$~64

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1353/2026**

SUJATA YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vinod Kumar Sharma, Mr. Neeraj
Sood, Ms. Priya, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP with
SI Pragati Rana.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

08.04.2026

%

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in e-FIR No. 80016161/2026 dated 22.02.2026, registered at PS Dwarka, North, for commission of offence under Section 305 of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita* (BNS), 2023 (corresponding Section 380 IPC).

2. The abovesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint received by a Mongolian national who had come to Delhi for treatment of her six month old daughter. During such period of treatment, she was residing at Kakrola Kunj, Sector-3, Dwarka, and had engaged two nursing staff through *Dwarka Best Nursing Care Agency*.

3. The applicant herein is one such nursing staff, who was deputed for day-duty. The other nursing staff was given night-duty so that there is appropriate *round-the-clock* care to the abovesaid child.

4. According to the complainant, there was a money-bag in her almirah which was having 7,200 USD and when she checked the same on 21.02.2026 at about 1:00 P.M., she found the zip of such money bag opened and upon counting, she found 5,500 USD to be missing.

5. The police, during investigation collected CCTV Footage and noticed

BAIL APPLN. 1353/2026

1



suspicious movement of the applicant. She was accordingly served with notice to join the investigation but fact remains that despite such notice, she did not join the investigation.

6. Admittedly, when the matter was pending consideration before the learned Court of Sessions, she was permitted to join the investigation and during such investigation, she had claimed that, though, she was on duty on the relevant date and time but since she was not feeling well, she had taken leave of four days, and in the interregnum, she had also taken some treatment from a private hospital.

7. The abovesaid aspect got verified but the concerned doctor informed the police that she had come to him for a minor issue which did not require any break or bed rest or absence from her routine activities.

8. Learned APP for the State, on instruction from IO, submits that the CCTV Footage clearly indicates complicity of the applicant and that other nursing staff has already joined the investigation and when the matter was reported to the abovesaid placement agency, despite the fact that the agency had tried to contact the applicant, she remained elusive and did not come forward. According to him, the *plea* of *alibi* which is being taken by the applicant is to avoid the clutches of law which is devoid of any merit, particularly, in view of the CCTV Footage. It is also submitted that the stolen money is yet to be recovered and, therefore, it is a fit case where the police would require custodial interrogation.

9. This Court has also gone through the order dated 16.03.2026, whereby the learned Trial Court has, eventually, dismissed the application seeking anticipatory bail. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case, this Court also does not find any merit or substance in the present application as her custodial



interrogation would be very much imperative.

10. Application is, accordingly, dismissed.

MANOJ JAIN, J

APRIL 8, 2026/sw/sa