$~8

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

\+ BAIL APPLN. 6/2026

MEERA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kshitij Gaur, Mr. Devanand Kumar, Mr. Shahdi Raza, Mr. Sachidanand, Ms. Simran Saba, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP with Mr. Tushar Nirwan, Advocate.
SI Ram Singh, PS Shahbad Dairy.
Mr. Akshay Ravi, Advocate for Complainant.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% 24.02.2026

1. By way of this application, the petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with FIR No. 320/2025, dated 06.05.2025, registered under Sections 419/420/467/471/474/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Shahbad Dairy.

2. I have heard Mr. Kshitij Gaur, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Tarang Srivastava, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, and Mr. Akshay Ravi, learned counsel for the complainant.

3. Mr. Srivastava has handed over a status report dated 09.01.2026, which is taken on record.

4. The facts, as stated in the status report, are that the complainant is the owner of the property, bearing No. C-1/156, Sector 28, Rohini, Delhi.

In November 2023, co-accused Vivek, who was introduced to her through one Satinder [since deceased], offered her the opportunity to purchase the adjacent property, bearing No. C-1/155, Sector 28, Rohini, Delhi ["subject property"]. He introduced the complainant to two persons claiming to be the owners of the subject property, who represented themselves to be Vijender Kumar Jain and Usha Jain. The complainant alleges that she paid a sum of Rs. 98 lakhs to the aforesaid two persons, including demand drafts of Rs. 22 lakhs each, in the names of Vijender Kumar Jain and Usha Jain. The registered sale deed dated 08.02.2024 was also executed in the complainant's favour, and possession of the property was handed over to her. Subsequently, it was discovered that the aforesaid purported sellers were not in fact the erstwhile owners of the subject property, but were co-accused Anand Sharma and the petitioner herein, who impersonated the original owners.

5. The status report records that, in the course of investigation, it was discovered that the property was allotted to Vijender Kumar Jain and Usha Jain by the Delhi Development Authority, and they stated that they had never sold the subject property. The allegation against the petitioner and co-accused Anand Sharma is that they presented forged identity documents to the sub-registrar, facilitated registration of the forged sale deed, and accepted a sum of Rs. 98 lakhs from the complainant. The status report states that in the course of inquiry, the bank account opened by the petitioner in the name of Usha Jain was found to be credited with the sum of Rs. 22 lakhs. However, the amount was transferred by cheque to the bank account of co-accused Vivek at PNB Shahbad Daulatpur, Delhi.

6. The chargesheet has since been filed, and a supplementary chargesheet is awaited.

7. Mr. Gaur submits that the petitioner is a senior citizen and a woman. She also has no criminal antecedents. Taking the case of the prosecution at the highest, it is submitted that the petitioner was involved in a fraudulent transaction, in which the relevant documents have already been recovered by the prosecution. The money allegedly received by her was also transferred to co-accused Vivek.

8. Mr. Gaur relies upon the orders of the Sessions Court dated 23.09.2025 and 30.10.2025, by which bail was granted to co-accused Vivek and Anand Sharma respectively. He submits that the Sessions Court has nonetheless refused bail to the petitioner, by order dated 21.11.2025, without any distinction between the cases of the other co-accused and that of the petitioner.

9. Mr. Srivastava and Mr. Ravi, on the other hand, oppose the grant of bail, by referring to the seriousness of the allegation against the petitioner, which involves forgery of documentation, including opening of a bank account in the name of Usha Jain, presentation of an Aadhaar Card in the name of Usha Jain, and entering into the sale deed impersonating Usha Jain. Between co-accused Anand Sharma and the petitioner, they have also allegedly received a sum of Rs. 98 lakhs from the complainant. They submit that, although a chargesheet has been filed, further investigation is under way, and a supplementary chargesheet is expected.

10. Mr. Ravi also submits that the complainant has already moved this Court for cancellation of bail granted to co-accused Vivek [CRL.M.C.

7998/2025], which remains pending. He submits that the complainant also intends to pursue similar remedies in respect of co-accused Anand Sharma.

11. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that it is appropriate in the present case to grant regular bail to the petitioner, for the following reasons:

a. Although the petitioner is accused of a serious offence, the evidence in the case is largely documentary. The investigation has already been substantially completed and a chargesheet filed.

b. To the extent that the chargesheet refers to pending investigation, the proposed investigation is with regard to interrogation of bank officials, sub-registrar, obtaining the FSL report, investigation *qua* a notary public and one Lalta Prasad, who Mr. Srivastava states is an associate to whom co-accused Vivek had transferred money. The investigation *qua* the petitioner thus appears to be complete.

c. The documents have already been recovered by the prosecution, including the documents allegedly forged by the petitioner herein.

d. In the status report filed by the Investigating Officer ["IO"], paragraph 5 reads as follows:

> "*(5) During the enquiry, the IO obtained the transaction details and KYC documents of Account Nos. 762002000005876 and 762002000006040 from Nainital Bank Ltd., Paschim Vihar, Delhi.* ***<u>Upon analysis, it was found that the complainant had transferred Rs.22 lakhs each into the above two accounts. It was also revealed that from both of these bank accounts, the amount was transferred via cheque to the bank account of Vivek</u>*** *at PNB, Shahbad Daulatpur, Delhi.*"

[Emphasis supplied.]

The contention in the status report is thus, that the amount received by the petitioner in the account of Usha Jain, was subsequently transferred to co-accused Vivek. Mr. Srivastava submits, at the bar, that some part of the amount of Rs. 22 lakhs transferred into the aforesaid account was, in fact, withdrawn in cash, and not transferred to Vivek by cheque. However, it is submitted that more than Rs. 17 lakhs have been transferred to co-accused Vivek and his associates. While the inaccuracy in the status report is a matter of concern, the aforesaid position does not materially affect the fact that most of the amount was transferred, and the evidence regarding the transaction is already in the possession of the prosecution.

e. Most significantly, co-accused have already been granted bail, and the case of the present petitioner is no graver than that of the co-accused. In fact, little distinction is to be found between the role of co-accused Anand Sharma and role of present petitioner, both of which were enumerated in the charge sheet. Mr. Srivastava also did not point to any substantial distinction in the case of the aforesaid co-accused and the petitioner herein. Although Mr. Ravi submitted, at the bar, that an application for cancellation of bail granted to co-accused Anand Sharma is in contemplation, the fact remains that the complainant has not filed any such proceedings for over three months. The proceedings against the grant of bail to Vivek will naturally be considered on its own merits.

f. The petitioner admittedly has no prior criminal antecedents.

g. The proceedings are still at the stage of filing of supplementary charge sheet. In the main charge sheet, 29 witnesses have been cited, and it is possible that more witnesses will be cited in the supplementary charge sheet. The trial is thus likely to take considerable period of time.

12. Having regard to the aforesaid factors, I am of the view that it is not appropriate to deprive the petitioner of her liberty further. It is directed that the petitioner be released on bail in connection with FIR 320/2025, dated 06.05.2025, registered at Police Station Shahbad Dairy. The petitioner will be released, subject to furnishing of a bail bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety of the like amount, to the satisfaction of duty Magistrate/ Trial Court, and subject to the following conditions:

a. The petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every date of hearing;

b. The petitioner shall provide her permanent address to the Trial Court, as reflected in the prison records, as also the address where she will be residing during the pendency of the case. The petitioner shall intimate the IO, and file an affidavit before the Trial Court, regarding any change in residential address.

c. The petitioner shall provide her mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO, which shall be kept in working condition at all times. The mobile number shall not be switched off or changed without prior intimation to the IO during the pendency of the trial;

d. The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Trial Court;

e. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;

f. The petitioner shall not commit any offence during the period of her release.

13. The bail application is disposed of in terms of the above.

14. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail application, and shall neither influence the trial proceedings, nor be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15. Copy of the order be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent electronically for information and necessary compliance.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 24, 2026

'pv'/AD/