

25 Bail Matters 880/2026 MAMTA AMBAWTA Vs. STATE 14/2026
(Crime Branch -N.W.Delhi)

18.07.2026

The undersigned is also looking after the work of another Court, as Ld. Link ASJ is on training today.

Present : Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
None for applicant/ accused.

1. **This is an application which has been moved under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail for applicant/accused Mamta Ambawta.**

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that no similar application of the applicant/accused is pending before any other court.

3. Reply already filed. Copy thereof already supplied.
Application is listed for orders today.

4. Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused argued on the lines of bail application. It is stated that the complainant himself is a Traffic Police Officer posted at Narela Circle and has stated that he received a WhatsApp call from mobile No. 70XXXXXX91 on 15/01/2026 at around 10:14 PM, from a person claiming to be Sikander, who alleged that the complainant was captured on video accepting bribes and threatened to upload the said video on social media unless money was paid. It is further stated that the applicant is named as a co-accused in

the said FIR. It is further stated that the applicant is a law-abiding citizen with no prior criminal antecedents and she has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the co-accused namely Sachin (applicant's husband), has already been granted bail and the Applicant is entitled to bail on the ground of parity. It is further submitted that the applicant has no intention to flee from justice and she is ready and willing to cooperate fully with the investigation. It is further stated that she had joined the investigation during pendency of this application and she had cooperated during interrogation. She undertakes to join the investigation as and when required, not to tamper with evidence or influence witnesses, and to inform the Investigating Officer of any change in address or contact details. While adducing arguments, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused has placed reliance on **Vinay Kumar Gupta vs State of Madhya Pradesh, 2026 LiveLaw (SC) 180.**

5. Ld. Additional PP for the State assisted by IO opposed the application stating that she was member of the racket of extortion of traffic police personnel by making their videos surreptitiously while they were busy in making challans of vehicles. Later, they used to edit the video and send the same to the targetted traffic police personnel and threaten them to make the video viral on social media and make their false complaint to senior officers. It is further submitted that though applicant joined the investigation but she has not cooperated during interrogation as she did not provide her bank account numbers and she

did not produce her mobile phone during interrogation. It is also stated that though she had stated that she did not come to Delhi in the month of January 2026 but as per her CDR, she visited Delhi frequently in the month of January 2026.

6. Submissions heard. Record perused.

7. As per the reply of IO, brief facts of the case are that the present case was registered on the complaint of ASI Azad Singh, ZO Traffic Police, in which he alleged that on 15.01.2026, he received a WhatsApp call on his mobile phone and the caller disclosed his name as Sikandar. The caller threatened him that he has a video showing him taking bribe while on duty and demanded Rs.2,00,000/- for deleting the same else the video would be made viral and also be sent to senior officers. Due to repeated threats and harassment, the complainant paid Rs.60,000/- in cash on 16.01.2026 and again Rs.60,000/- on 17.01.2026 to Sikandar.

8. The case was taken up for investigation. During investigation, accused Amir @ Sikander So Mohd Salim Chaudhary has been arrested in Case FIR No. 101/25 U/s 221/132/318(4)/61(2)/3(5)/112 BNS, PS Crime Branch on 17.01.2026. The IO of the case was contacted and it was further revealed that Rs.60000/- and two mobile phones were recovered from the possession of accused Aamir @ Sikandar during his arrest in that case. The mobile

number 76XXXXXX91, which was used to make extortion call to the complainant of the present case, was recovered from accused Amir @ Sikandar. Accused Amir @ Sikandar was interrogated after prior permission from the Court. During interrogation, accused Amir @ Sikander disclosed that he has been doing the work of extortion of traffic police personnel for the past 2 years. He also disclosed that co-accused Sneha is running this racket of extortion of traffic police personnel by making video of police personnel while they are doing challans of vehicles. During investigation, accused Pooja @ Sneha was apprehended at the instance of accused Aamir @ Sikander and accused Pooja @ Sneha disclosed during interrogation that one Sachin, Mamta & Sumit are also involved in this extortion racket with her.

9. It is evident from the report of the IO that name of applicant surfaced during disclosure statement of accused Pooja @ Sneha. It is pertinent to mention here that co-accused Pooja remained in police custody for two days and despite that nothing was recovered from her. During arguments, IO fairly conceded that no audio/video recording as to any alleged threat has been recovered by the Investigating Agency. Merely because the applicant has not provided her bank account number or mobile phone, is not ground to deny the relief of anticipatory bail as accused has already joined the investigation and there is no strong evidence of her involvement in the alleged incident except disclosure statement of co-accused who has already been granted regular bail. In **Vinay Kumar Gupta (Supra)** Hon'ble

Supreme Court, wherein it was the complaint of State that appellant has not handed over his mobile phone, held that “It is for the State to complete the investigation in accordance with due procedure but, in this regard, it cannot insist upon the appellant incriminating himself. Cooperating with the investigation does not extend to violation of the Constitutional right against self-incrimination.” Considering the overall facts and circumstances, role of the applicant and finding no ground for custodial interrogation at this stage, **the present application stands allowed.** In the event of arrest, applicant / accused **Mamta Ambawta** be released on bail on furnishing personal bond / surety bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- to the satisfaction of IO / SHO concerned.

10. The applicant is directed to join the investigation as and when directed by the investigating agency. She shall also provide all the required cooperation to the IO.

11. Nothing stated hereinabove shall have any bearing on the merits of this case.

12. **Application is disposed of accordingly.**

(MUNEESH GARG)
ASJ-03 (NORTH-WEST)
ROHINI COURTS
DELHI/18.07.2026