



2026:DHC:2153



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Date of Decision: 16.03.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2869/2024 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 1344/2024**

MANJU AGGARWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sumit Kumar, Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State.
Mr. Danish Khan, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 100/2024 of PS DBG Road for offence under Section 420/406/506/120B IPC.

2. This anticipatory bail application came up for the first hearing on 13.08.2024 before the predecessor bench and thereafter continued getting adjourned before different benches. By order dated 13.08.2024, the accused/applicant was granted interim protection from arrest subject to joining investigation and that protection continues till date on date to date basis. Thereafter, along with 179 such old pending bail applications, this



2026:DHC:2153



application was transferred to this bench. Today is the first hearing before me.

3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant is that she is Director of a construction company, which got embroiled into a dispute with the sellers of the subject immovable property. In the course of hearings, by way of order dated 17.09.2025, the predecessor bench referred the matter to the Delhi High Court Mediation Centre and today it is submitted by both sides that the matter stands settled.

4. Against the above backdrop, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that she deserves to be granted anticipatory bail. Learned APP for State submits that the mediation cannot be a ground to grant anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for complainant *de facto* supports the accused/applicant.

5. Of course, merely because the civil dispute between the parties gets settled in mediation proceedings, the accused cannot claim anticipatory bail as a matter of right. It is trite that the bail courts are not the money recovery forum. But at the same time, it also cannot be ignored that the complainant *de facto* also had requested before the predecessor bench for referral of the dispute to settlement and today they do not object to grant of anticipatory bail. It also cannot be ignored that the State never objected to this settlement process. More importantly, it is Sh. Ram Avtar, husband of the present accused/applicant, against whom all allegations of the FIR are directed, but



2026:DHC:2153



he has not been arrested. The accused/applicant is a 65 years old lady and her only role is being a formal Director of the construction company in question.

6. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find any ground to deny liberty to the accused/applicant. Therefore, the anticipatory bail application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of her arrest, the accused/applicant shall be released on bail, subject to her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the IO/SHO concerned. Accompanying application stands disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

MARCH 16, 2026/ry