



**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(S). OF 2025
(SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION(S) (CRL.) NO(S).357/2025)**

PUJA MANORAMA DILIP KHEDKAR

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

Leave granted.

This appeal challenges the order dated 23.12.2024 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in Bail Application No. 2828 of 2024.

Apprehending arrest in connection with crime registered pursuant to FIR No.142 of 2024 dated 19.07.2024 lodged with Police Station Crime Branch, Delhi in respect of the offences punishable under Sections 420, 464, 465, 471 of Indian Penal Code 1860, and Section 66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and Section 89/91 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Act, 2016, the appellant preferred an application before the High Court seeking anticipatory bail in terms of Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (hereinafter "BNSS").

The said application for anticipatory bail has been rejected by the High Court *vide* the impugned order dated 23.12.2024. Hence, the instant appeal has been preferred.

By order dated 15.01.2025, while issuing notice, this Court granted interim protection in favour of the appellant.

We have heard learned counsel for the appellant in support of the appeal and learned counsel for the respondent-state.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the appellant herein submitted that FIR No.142 of 2024 has been registered against the appellant herein under Sections 420, 464, 465, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and Section 89/91 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016; that these offences are alleged against the appellant which have to be proved in accordance with law beyond reasonable doubt; that

the investigation as against the appellant herein is being conducted since July, 2024 and there has been complete cooperation by the appellant in the investigation; that having regard to the nature of offences alleged against her and bearing in mind the facts and circumstances of the case this is a fit case where the High Court ought to have granted the relief of anticipatory bail to the appellant herein. In the circumstances, it was contended that the impugned order may be set aside and the relief may be granted to the appellant herein subject to the terms and conditions to be imposed on her.

Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondent vehemently objected to the grant of relief to the appellant herein inasmuch as the appellant has not been cooperating with the investigation although she may be appearing before the investigating authority as and when she has been summoned to do so. Learned counsel contended that the allegations against the appellant herein are serious inasmuch as she has exceeded in the number of attempts which she could take in appearing for the civil services

exam on the basis of a disability certificate which has been procured by her fraudulently, when in fact she is not entitled to that certificate at all. He contended that if any relief of anticipatory bail is granted to the appellant herein, then the investigation itself may be jeopardised and consequently the criminal proceedings would be frustrated. Learned counsel therefore, submitted that the High Court was right in dismissing the plea made for anticipatory bail and there is no merit in this appeal.

Considering the circumstances on record, in our view, the appellant is entitled to the relief claimed under Section 482 of BNSS.

We, therefore, allow this appeal and set aside the order passed by the High Court dated 23.12.2024.

We direct that in the event of arrest of the appellant, the Arresting Officer shall release the appellant on bail subject to furnishing cash security in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only) with two like sureties.

It is directed that the appellant shall extend complete cooperation in the ensuing investigation.

The appellant shall not misuse her liberty and shall not in any way influence the witnesses or tamper with the material on record.

Should there be any violation of the aforesaid conditions, then liberty is reserved to the respondent herein to seek cancellation of anticipatory bail.

With the aforesaid directions, the criminal appeal is allowed.

....., J.
(B.V. NAGARATHNA)

....., J.
(SATISH CHNDRA SHARMA)

NEW DELHI;
MAY 21, 2025

ITEM NO.3

COURT NO.6

SECTION II-C

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (CRL.) NO(S). 357/2025

[ARISING OUT OF IMPUGNED FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 23-12-2024 IN BA NO. 2828/2024 PASSED BY THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI]

PUJA MANORAMA DILIP KHEDKAR

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

IA NO. 5876/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA NO. 5875/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES

Date : 21-05-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA

For Petitioner(s) : M/S. Lawyer S Knit & Co, AOR
Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Bina Madhavan, Adv.
Mr. Rajsahed Patil, Adv.
Ms. Shreyasi Kunwar, Adv.
Mr. Nimesh Thomas, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Suryaprakash V Raju, A.S.G.
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.
Mr. Zoheb Hussain, Adv.
Mr. Hitarth Raja, Adv.
Mr. Amit Sharma - B, Adv.
Ms. Sunit Choudhary, Adv.

Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vardhman Kaushik, AOR
Mr. Anand Singh, Adv.
Mr. Shantanu Shukla, Adv.
Ms. Shikha John, Adv.
Mrs. P S Vijayadharni, Adv.

Mr. Dhruv Joshi, Adv.
Mr. Mayank Sharma, Adv.
Mrs. Sanjana Mehrotra, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Leave granted.

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed
order, which is placed on file.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand
disposed of.

(B. LAKSHMI MANIKYA VALLI)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(DIVYA BABBAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)