



2026:DHC:969



trial court of learned Special Judge, NDPS Act and the learned court allowed her interrogation by the investigating officer in court premises till post lunch session. Subsequent to her interrogation, the learned trial court took up her bail application and after hearing both sides, admitted the respondent/accused to bail subject to certain conditions.

4. Cancellation of bail granted to the respondent/accused is sought only on the ground that the bail was wrongly granted. Learned APP for State, in all fairness, clarifies that the cancellation of bail is not being sought on account of any supervening circumstance, much less, on any allegation of misuse of liberty. Learned APP for State submits that the learned trial court ought not to have granted bail in view of seriousness of the offence and nascent stage of the investigation.

5. On being called upon to disclose any admissible evidence against the respondent/accused on the basis whereof she could be deprived of liberty by the trial court, learned APP for State submits that the evidence is in the form of confessional statement of son-in-law of the respondent/accused. Further, it is submitted by learned APP for State that in the course of her interrogation in the court premises, the respondent/accused after certain stage refused to answer the queries. Since the respondent/accused was evasive in her interrogation, she ought not to have been granted bail.

6. So far as the stand taken by the State that during interrogation the respondent/accused was evasive, I find no merit in the argument. It is the investigatorial skills of the interrogator, which are important. If the



interrogator is not skilled, the interrogatee cannot be blamed as being evasive, much less, for the purposes of bail.

7. Ultimately, there is no incriminating evidence on the basis whereof liberty of the respondent/accused could be curtailed. Significantly, in the remand application (*copy whereof is Annexure P-6*), there is not even a whisper if any incriminating article has to be recovered from the respondent/accused. The confessional statement of son-in-law of the respondent/accused, which was recorded when he was in police custody, did not lead to any recovery with which the respondent/accused could be connected.

8. I am unable to find any infirmity in the impugned order, whereby the respondent/accused was admitted to bail subject to a number of conditions which would ensure that she attends the trial and does not interfere with the prosecution evidence.

9. Therefore, the impugned order is upheld and the present petition and the accompanying applications are dismissed.

10. Copy of this order be sent to learned trial court.

**GIRISH
KATHPALIA**

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: cn=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b265fffe4afec45569af39
62c68b48356435f97626cacc, ou=HIGH COURT OF
DELHI, CID = 7047638, postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,
serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5d15570996b4
0f80cbd2eee60402c487965ff801e26fa, cn=GIRISH
KATHPALIA
Date: 2026.02.05 17:49:25 +08'00'

FEBRUARY 05, 2026/as