

IA No. 17/2025
SC No. 167/2023
State Vs. Parul
FIR No. 166/2023
PS: Karawal Nagar
U/s: 302/201/120-B/34 IPC

17.10.2025

**ORDER ON APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF REGULAR BAIL
FILED ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT/ACCUSED PARUL**

1. This order of mine shall dispose of an application for bail filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Parul.
2. I have already heard Ld. Counsel for the applicant /accused and Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
3. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that in the present case, investigation is complete and chargesheet has already been filed and the case is at the stage of prosecution evidence and submitted that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused person, however, she has nothing to do with the alleged offence and the applicant/accused is in judicial custody since 21.04.2023, except the period of interim bail.
4. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused further submitted that in the present case, there is no public/eyewitness, therefore, there is no apprehension of influencing the witnesses by the applicant/accused and submitted that nothing incriminating has been recovered from, or at the instance of the applicant/accused and the applicant/accused is having clean antecedents and she is neither having previous involvement, nor convict and submitted that the applicant/accused is an innocent lady and it would cause great

prejudice to the right of the applicant/accused by keeping her behind the bar for indefinite period.

5. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused further submitted that the applicant/accused was earlier granted interim bails for a period of two weeks and it was further extended, however, during the said period, she did not misuse the liberty and timely surrendered before the jail and submitted that in the present case, the prosecution has cited total 38 witnesses and it may take long time in concluding the trial, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant/accused in judicial custody for indefinite period and submitted that the applicant/accused is a law-abiding and peace-loving citizen of India and she is a widow lady aged about 30 years old, having liabilities of two minor children and old aged father-in-law and she is only bread earner of her family and the applicant/accused undertakes that she will not temper with the evidence in any manner and she is also ready to abide by all the terms and conditions as imposed upon her, if she is granted bail and prayed for grant of bail to the applicant/accused.

6. On the other hand, Sh. F. M. Ansari, Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor for the State vehemently opposed the present application for bail and submitted that in the case in hand, the applicant/accused alongwith the co-accused persons had hatched a criminal conspiracy to kill deceased Mahi and accordingly, after hatching the criminal conspiracy by the accused persons, Mahi was killed.

7. Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor for the State further submitted that the charges against the present applicant/accused

have been framed u/s. 120-B, 302/34 & 201/34 IPC, which are heinous in nature and submitted that evidence of the prosecution is yet to be started, therefore, there is possibility of hampering with the witnesses and tampering with the evidence, if the applicant/accused is released on bail at this stage, hence, the applicant/accused does not deserve the concession of regular bail and prayed that this application for grant of regular bail filed on behalf of the applicant/accused may be dismissed.

8. In his reply, the IO has submitted that the offences committed by the applicant/accused are of heinous and brutal nature, involved cold blooded conspiracy and murder of the deceased. The applicant/accused was the main conspirator and played a pivotal role in commission of the offences. The CCTV footage clearly corroborates the involvement of the applicant /accused in the present offence. There is possibility of tampering with the evidence, as the applicant/accused resides in the same locality, where, several witnesses of the prosecution reside.

9. I have given thoughtful consideration to the submissions made by counsel for this applicant/accused and perused the record including the report of Medical Officer In-Charge.

10. Perusal of the record shows that this applicant /accused alongwith the other co-accused persons are alleged to have hatched a criminal conspiracy to kill deceased Mahi and in pursuance of the criminal conspiracy, this applicant/accused alongwith the other co-accused persons are also alleged to have committed the murder of deceased Mahi. Perusal of the record also shows that charges against the applicant/accused have already been framed u/s. 120-B,

302/34 & 201/34 IPC. The evidence of the prosecution is yet to be started and material witnesses are yet to be examined, therefore, there is possibility of hampering with the witnesses and tampering with the evidence, if the applicant/accused is released on bail at this stage. The applicant/accused may also flee away from justice.

11. So, taking into consideration the nature of accusation, gravity of offences alleged to have been committed by this applicant/accused, the fact that charges against the applicant/accused are heinous in nature and evidence of the prosecution is yet to be started and in case, this applicant/accused is granted bail, she may hamper with the prosecution witnesses or may tamper with the evidence and she may also flee away from justice, this applicant/accused does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

12. In the above said terms, the application for grant of regular bail filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Parul stands **dismissed**.

13. Copy of this order be given dasti.

14. Attested copy of this order be sent to the Superintendent of Central Jail concerned for supplying the same to the applicant/accused.

(PUNEET PAHWA)
**Special Judge (NDPS)/Addl. Sessions Judge/
North East/KKD Courts/Delhi/17.10.2025**