

CNR No.DLWT01-010394-2025
CT No.19/2025
ECIR/HIU-II/24-2025 dated 11/08/2025
U/s 3/ 4 PML Act
Directorate of Enforcement Vs. Amit Gupta @
Nageshwar Gupta & Anr.

04/11/2025

File taken up today on the bail application u/s. 485 BNSS read with Section 45 PMLA of the accused Sandeepa Virk for grant of regular bail

Present: Sh. Simon Benjamin, Ld. Special PP for Directorate of Enforcement (through VC).
None for the accused.

By way of present order, this Court shall disposed of aforesaid bail application of the accused Sandeepa Virk for grant of regular bail.

Arguments have already been heard on the aforesaid bail application of the accused Sandeepa Virk. Perused the material available on record.

During the course of arguments on the aforesaid bail application, it was submitted by counsel for the accused Sandeepa Virk that the present bail application is the first regular bail application of the accused Sandeepa Virk after filing of the prosecution complaint and no other regular bail application of the accused is pending or decided by the Hon'ble Superior Courts. It was further submitted that the accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and there is no incriminating evidence against the accused and investigation in the present case has already been completed and the accused is no more required for the purpose of further investigation as prosecution complaint has already been filed in the present case. It was further submitted that the accused has nothing to do with the alleged offence. It was further submitted that in the present case, the accused was

arrested on 12/08/2025. It was further submitted that the present ECIR was recorded on the basis of scheduled offence u/s. 420 IPC in case FIR No.91/2016 PS Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali. It was further submitted that in the FIR No.91/2016 PS Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali, the complainant Jasneet Kaur had not ascribed any specific role against the accused Sandeepa Virk regarding receiving of money by the complainant from the accused Sandeepa Virk. It was further submitted that in the aforesaid FIR, all the allegations are against the accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta. It was further submitted that after the completion of the investigation, police officials of FIR No.91/2016 PS Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali came to the conclusion that the accused Sandeepa Virk is not involved in the aforesaid predicate offence and not guilty of alleged offence. It was further submitted that after the conclusion of the investigation, the charge-sheet was filed only against the accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta. It was further submitted that after the period of nine years of registration of FIR No.91/2016 PS Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali, the present ECIR was registered by the Directorate of Enforcement. It was further submitted that the accused has no role whatsoever in commission of scheduled offence or any offence under PMLA. It was further submitted that accused Sandeepa Virk was neither named in the FIR No.91/2016 PS Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali nor she gained any monetary or personal benefit. It was further submitted that there was no possession of proceeds of crime or even an indication that the proceeds of crime ever received by the accused. It was further submitted that in the present case, the investigating agency has not conducted fair and proper investigation. It was further submitted that in the present case, investigating agency has adopted a selective policy in arresting and arraigning as accused in the present case. It was further submitted that accused has been in the business of herbal products since the year 2022 and she is also a social media influencer,

having regular income from her acting career and other business. It was further submitted that accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta was having relationship with the accused Sandeepa Virk and accused Sandeepa Virk was falsely implicated in FIR No.91/2016 PS Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali. It was further submitted that the accused Sandeepa Virk never met with the complainant of the aforesaid FIR. It was further submitted that the accused Sandeepa Virk moved out of the relationship with Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta after she was subjected to domestic violence. It was further submitted that in the present case, accused Sandeepa Virk was arrested in haste and without any justification or reason and without giving any opportunity to present her defence to show her innocence. It was further submitted that as per Directorate of Enforcement, the accused was engaged in creating undue influence by misrepresenting herself and she duped the people by taking money from them but the Directorate of Enforcement has no proof or justification for the aforesaid allegations. It was further submitted that Directorate of Enforcement has failed to show whether any money was taken by the accused Sandeepa Virk from any person or whether the said funds were the proceeds of crime. It was further submitted that accused was arrested illegally from her residence. It was further submitted that arrest of the accused is an abuse of process u/s. 19 PMLA. It was further submitted that at the time of arrest of the accused, no material was existed justifying the arrest of the accused. It was further submitted that the accused was not given an opportunity to join the investigation prior to her arrest. It was further submitted that there is no reasonable basis to presume that the accused may be guilty for commission of offence u/s. 3 PMLA. It was further submitted that Directorate of Enforcement has not placed on record any legally admissible evidence in support of its allegations. It was further submitted that personal relations of the accused with any other person does not in any manner establish that the accused is

guilty of the offence u/s. 3 PMLA. It was further submitted that there is no material to show that the accused can be held liable for generation, concealment and possession of proceeds of crime. It was further submitted that the accused has duly explained the ownership of the assets in her statements. It was further submitted that Directorate of Enforcement in order to make out a false and frivolous case has questioned the purchasing of small properties. It was further submitted that *mens rea* is a necessary ingredient to make out the offence of money laundering. It was further submitted that the accused has not derived any monetary benefit from the alleged transactions. It was further submitted that accused has never committed any act/omission with an malafide/oblique motive. It was further submitted that all the alleged transactions are much before the registration of FIR for the scheduled offence. It was further submitted that the accused falls under the second proviso of Section 45 PMLA, therefore, *per se* not required to satisfy the twin conditions as mentioned in Section 45 PMLA. It was further submitted that no prima-facie case is made out against the accused and all allegations against her are not tenable. It was further submitted that the accused has always provided complete and full co-operation to the investigating agency. It was further submitted that the accused is entitled for bail as she meets the triple test required for bail. It was further submitted that it is well settled law that mere apprehension of tampering with evidence or influencing of witnesses, without any concrete basis, cannot be ground to deny bail to the accused. It was further submitted that it is also well settled law that bail is the rule and jail is the exception. It was further submitted that seriousness/veracity of the allegations levelled against the accused are subject matter of trial. It was further submitted that accused had an unblemished career as an actress. It was further submitted that the present case is at the stage of cognizance and the trial will take considerable time. It was further submitted that accused

is having clean antecedents. It was further submitted that mother of the accused is not well. It was further submitted that accused is in JC since 18/08/2025. It was further submitted that the regular bail be granted to the accused and the accused shall be abide by all terms and conditions imposed by the Court.

Ld. Counsel for the accused in support of his contentions has relied upon following case laws-

1. Shashi Bala @ Shashi Bala Singh V. Directorate of Enforcement {Criminal Appeal No.212 of 2025 decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 15/01/2025}
2. Kalvakuntla Kavitha V. Directorate of Enforcement (2024 SCC OnLine 2269)
3. Dr. Bindu Rana V. Serious Fraud Investigation Office {(2023) 239 Comp Case 170}
4. Komal Chadha V. Serious Fraud Investigation Office {Bail Application No.1740/2022 & CRL. M. (BAIL) 746/2022, CRL.M.A.20763/2022, decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi on 21/12/2022}
5. Archana Ajay Mittal V. Enforcement Directorate {Bail Application No.71/2024 decided by the Special Judge PC-ACT (CBI)-16, Rouse Avenue District Court, New Delhi on 14/02/2024}
6. Directorate of Enforcement V. Archana Ajay Mittal (order dated 26/03/2025 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Crl. M.C. No.2602/2024 & Crl.M.A. 9927/2024)
7. Vipin Yadav & Anr. V. Directorate of Enforcement (Bail Application No.1763/2025 & 2257/2025 decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi on 26/09/2025}
8. Prem Prakash V. Union of India {(2024) 9 SCC 787}
9. Himansh @ Himanshu Verma Vs. Directorate of Enforcement {2024 SCC OnLine SC 4697}

10. Ramesh Manglani Vs. Directorate of Enforcement
{(2023) 7 High Court Cases (Del) 134}
11. Sanjay Kansal V. Assistant Director, Directorate of
Enforcement (2024 SCC OnLine Del 9569)
12. Pankaj Bansal V. Union of India {(2023) 12 SCR 714}
13. Arvind Kejriwal V. Directorate of Enforcement {(2024) 7
SCR 2363}
14. Mohammed Zubair V. State of NCT of Delhi & Ors.
{(2022) 18 SCR 494}
15. V. Senthil Balaji V. Deputy Director, Directorate of
Enforcement (2024 SCC OnLine SC 2626)
16. S.Martin V. Directorate of Enforcement (Special Leave to
Appeal Crl. No. 4768/2024 decided by the Hon'ble
Supreme Court of India on 10/04/2024)
17. Mahabir Prasad Rungta V. Directorate of Enforcement
(Special Leave to Appeal Crl. No. 12353/2024 decided by
the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 17/09/2024)

During the course of arguments, it was submitted by Special P.P. for the Directorate of Enforcement that the allegations against the accused are serious in nature and accused can abscond, if the bail is granted to the accused. It was further submitted that FIR No. 91/2016 Police Station Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali u/s 406/420 IPC was got registered against the accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta, Sandeepa Virk & Ors. on the allegations that the aforesaid accused persons had duped the amount of Rs.6 Crores approximately from the complainant and her family members on the pretext of giving her role of lead actress in a movie and making her invest in the production of same. It was further submitted that charge-sheet has already been filed in case FIR No.91/2016 Police Station Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali and accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta had

been declared as proclaimed person vide order dated 21/10/2024 passed by the Ld. JMFC, SAS Nagar, Mohali. It was further submitted that offence u/s 420 IPC is covered under the definition of scheduled offence as per PMLA, 2002 and ECIR/HIU-II/24-2025 dated 11/08/2025 u/s 3/ 4 PML Act was recorded. It was further submitted that accused Sandeepa Virk was engaged in creating undue influence by misrepresenting herself and duping the people by taking the money from them. It was further submitted that accused Sandeepa Virk used fake e-commerce website for money laundering activities and she claimed to be the owner of hyboocare.com, a website claiming to sell FDA approved beauty products having its registered address at WZ-44/1, Street No.13, Krishna Puri, Krishna Park, Old Mahavir Nagar, Tilak Nagar, New Delhi, however, the products listed on the website were found to be fake. It was further submitted that from the investigation, it is revealed that accused Sandeepa Virk does not have the source of income and a flat was acquired in Mumbai by her through money received from duping the complainant, which is proceeds of crime. It was further submitted that accused Sandeepa Virk had actively participated in the activities related to the offence of money laundering. It was further submitted that bail in cases involving heinous economic offences under PMLA, can only be granted only if the twin conditions laid down u/s. 45 PMLA are fulfilled and benefit of the same can be given subject to the discretion of the Court. It was further submitted that rigours of section 45 PMLA will not apply to a woman in view of proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 45 PMLA and the proviso does not operate automatically in favour of the woman and facts and circumstances of the case are to be considered. It was further submitted that the accused has committed grave economic offence and she is highly influential and she has potential to tamper with the evidence and influence the witnesses. It was further submitted that conduct of the accused, particularly the deliberate destruction of her

mobile phone, demonstrate her intent and capacity to interfere with the evidence and to frustrate the on-going investigation. It was further submitted that there is ample evidence on record to link the accused to the commission of the offence of Money Laundering and her release on bail would adversely affect further investigation to unearth the deep rooted multi-layered conspiracy. It was further submitted that further investigation of the present case is at very crucial stage on certain key aspects and certain facts are in the personal knowledge of the accused and she can hamper the investigation. It was further submitted that the accused cannot be enlarged on bail only on the basis of section 45 PMLA when the triple test remains un-fulfilled. It was further submitted that economic offences constitute a distinct category and warrant a differential approach for grant of bail. It was further submitted that accused Sandeepa Virk has committed the offence u/s. 3 of the Prevention of Money-Laundering Act, 2002. It was further submitted that the present case is at the stage of cognizance and in the present case, charge is yet to be framed and complainant and material witnesses are yet to be examined and if the bail is granted to the accused, she can abscond and tamper with the evidence and influence, threaten or pressurize the witnesses. It was further submitted that there is sufficient incriminating material against the accused and the regular bail application of accused Sandeepa Virk be dismissed.

Special PP for Directorate of Enforcement in support of his contentions has relied upon following case laws-

1. Sidhant Gupta V. The Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement {Special Leave to Appeal No. 14392/2024 decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 22/10/2024}
2. Tarun Kumar V. Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement {(2023) SCC OnLine SC 1486}

3. Central Bureau of Investigation V. V.Vijay Sai Reddy
{(2013) 7 SCC 425}
4. Saumya Chaurasia V. Directorate of Enforcement {(2024)
6 SCC 401}
5. Kalvakuntla Kavitha V. Directorate of Enforcement
{(2024) SCC OnLine SC 2269}
6. Vedpal Singh Tanwar V. Directorate of Enforcement
{2025 SCC OnLine Del 4330}
7. Vedpal Singh Tanwar V. Directorate of Enforcement
(Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 10839/2025 decided
by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 14/10/2025)
8. Shivani Rajiv Saxena V. Directorate of Enforcement &
Anr. {2017 SCC OnLine Del 10452}
9. Ranu Sahu V. Directorate of Enforcement {2024 SCC
OnLine Chh 840}
10. Arvind Dham V. Directorate of Enforcement {2025 SCC
OnLine Del 5533}
11. Anoop Bartaria & Ors. V. Deputy Director, Enforcement
Directorate & Anr. {(2023) 16 SCC 183}
12. Nimmagadda Prasad V. Central Bureau of Investigation
{(2013) 7 SCC 466}
13. Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy V. Central Bureau of
Investigation {(2013) 7 SCC 439}

It was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as “**Virupakshappa Gouda & Anr. V. State of Karnataka & Anr.**” {(2017) 5 SCC 406} that :

*“15. The court has to keep in mind what has been stated in **Chaman Lal v. State of U.P.** The requisite factors are: (i) the nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of*

conviction and the nature of supporting evidence; (ii) reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant; and (iii) prima facie satisfaction of the court in support of the charge.

*In **Prasanta Kumar Sarkar v. Ashis Chatterjee**, it has been opined that while exercising the power for grant of bail, the court has to keep in mind certain circumstances and factors. We may usefully reproduce the said passage:*

“9...among other circumstances, the factors which are to be borne in mind while considering an application for bail are:

(i) whether there is any prima facie or reasonable ground to be believe that the accused had committed the offence.

(ii) nature and gravity of the accusation;

(iii) severity of the punishment in the event of conviction;

(iv) danger of the accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail;

(v) character, behaviour, means, position and standing of the accused;

(vi) likelihood of the offence being repeated;

(vii) reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being influenced; and

(viii) danger, of course, of justice being thwarted by grant of bail.”

*16. In **CBI v. V. Vijay Sai Reddy**, the Court had reiterated the principle by observing thus:-“ 34.*

While granting bail, the court has to keep in mind the nature of accusation, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public/State and other similar considerations. It has also to be kept in mind that for the purpose of granting bail, the legislature has used the words “reasonable grounds for believing” instead of “the evidence” which means the court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy itself as to whether there is a genuine case

against the accused and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima facie evidence in support of the charge. It is not expected, at this stage, to have the evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt.”

*17. From the aforesaid principles, it is quite clear that an order of bail cannot be granted in an arbitrary or fanciful manner. In this context, we may, with profit, reproduce a passage from **Neeru Yadav v. State of U.P.**, wherein the Court setting aside an order granting bail observed:*

“16. The issue that is presented before us is whether this Court can annul the order passed by the High Court and curtail the liberty of the second respondent? We are not oblivious of the fact that the liberty is a priceless treasure for a human being. It is founded on the bedrock of constitutional right and accentuated further on human rights principle. It is basically a natural right. In fact, some regard it as the grammar of life. No one would like to lose his liberty or barter it for all the wealth of the world. People from centuries have fought for liberty, for absence of liberty causes sense of emptiness. The sanctity of liberty is the fulcrum of any civilized society. It is a cardinal value on which the civilisation rests. It cannot be allowed to be paralysed and immobilized. Deprivation of liberty of a person has enormous impact on his mind as well as body. A democratic body polity which is wedded to rule of law, anxiously guards liberty. But, a pregnant and significant one, the liberty of an individual is not absolute. The society by its collective wisdom through process of law can withdraw the liberty that it has sanctioned to an individual when an individual becomes a danger to the collective and to the societal order. Accent on individual liberty cannot be pyramided to that extent which would bring chaos and anarchy to a society. A society expects responsibility and accountability from its members, and it desires that the citizens should obey the law, respecting it as a cherished social norm. No individual can make an attempt to create a concavity in the stem of social stream. It is impermissible. Therefore, when an individual

behaves in a disharmonious manner ushering in disorderly things which the society disapproves, the legal consequences are bound to follow. At that stage, the Court has a duty. It cannot abandon its sacrosanct obligation and pass an order at its own whim or caprice. It has to be guided by the established parameters of law.”

It was held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as “**Kalyan Chandra Sarkar V. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav & Anr.**” {2004 Cri. L.J. 1796 (1)} that :

“11. The law in regard to grant or refusal of bail is very well settled. The Court granting bail should exercise its discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. Though at the stage of granting bail a detailed examination of evidence and elaborate documentation of the merit of the case need not be undertaken, there is a need to indicate in such orders reasons for prima facie concluding why bail was being granted particularly where the accused is charged of having committed a serious offence. Any order devoid of such reasons would suffer from non-application of mind. It is also necessary for the Court granting bail to consider among other circumstances, the following factors also before granting bail; they are,

(a) The nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence;

(b) Reasonable apprehension of tampering of the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant;

(c) Prima facie satisfaction of the Court in support of the charge.

12. In regard to cases where earlier bail applications have been rejected there is a further onus on the Court to consider the subsequent application for grant of bail by noticing the grounds on which earlier bail applications have been rejected and after such consideration if the Court is of the opinion that bail has to be granted then the said Court will have to give specific

reasons why in spite of such earlier rejection the subsequent application for bail should be granted.

14. In such cases, in our opinion, the mere fact that the accused has undergone certain period of incarceration (three years in this case) by itself would not entitle the accused to being enlarged on bail, nor the fact that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future either by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration would be sufficient for enlarging the appellant on bail when the gravity of the offence alleged is severe and there are allegations of tampering with the witnesses by the accused during the period he was on bail.

20. Before concluding, we must note though an accused has a right to make successive applications for grant of bail the Court entertaining such subsequent bail applications has a duty to consider the reasons and grounds on which the earlier bail applications were rejected. In such cases, the Court also has a duty to record what are the fresh grounds which persuade it to take a view different from the one taken in the earlier applications.....”

It was held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as “**Satish Jaggi V. State of Chhatisgarh & Ors.**” {AIR 2007 SC (Supp) 256} that :-

“5. It is well settled law that in granting or non-granting of bail in non-bailable offence, the primary consideration is the nature and gravity of the offence.....

12.At the stage of granting of bail, the court can only go into the question of the prima-facie case established for granting bail. It cannot go into the question of credibility and reliability of the witnesses put up by the prosecution. The question of credibility and reliability of prosecution witnesses can only be tested during the trial.”

It was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as "**Gurucharan Singh & Others V. State**" {AIR 1978 SC 179 (1)} that :-

"29. We may repeat the two paramount considerations, viz likelihood of the accused fleeing from justice and his tampering with prosecution evidence relate to ensuring a fair trial of the case in a court of justice. It is essential that due and proper weight should be bestowed on these two factors apart from others. There cannot be an inexorable formula in the matter of granting bail. The facts and circumstances of each case will govern the exercise of judicial discretion in granting or cancelling bail."

Similar propositions were also laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in cases titled as (1) *Sunil Kumar Vs. State of Bihar & Anr.* {Criminal Appeal No. 95/2022 decided on 25/01/2022} (2) *Bhoopendra Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr.* {Criminal Appeal No. 1279/2021 decided on 29/10/2021} and (3) *Anil Kumar Yadav Vs. State (NCT of Delhi)* {(2018) 12 SCC 129}.

In the present case, prosecution complaint u/s. 44 read with Section 45 of PMLA for the offence u/s 3 PMLA punishable under section 4 PMLA has been filed against the accused persons.

It is the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that FIR No. 91/2016 Police Station Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali u/s 406/420 IPC was got registered against the accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta & Ors. on the allegations that the aforesaid accused persons had duped the amount of Rs.6 Crores approximately from the complainant and her family members on the pretext of giving her role of lead actress in a movie and making her invest in the production of same. It is also the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that charge-sheet has already been filed in case FIR No.91/2016 Police Station Phase-8, SAS Nagar, Mohali and accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta had been declared as proclaimed person vide order dated 21/10/2024

passed by the Ld. JMFC, SAS Nagar, Mohali. It is also the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that offence u/s 420 IPC is covered under the definition of scheduled offence as per PMLA, 2002 and ECIR/HIU-II/24-2025 dated 11/08/2025 u/s 3/ 4 PML Act was recorded. It is also the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that accused Sandeepa Virk was engaged in creating undue influence by misrepresenting herself and duping the people by taking the money from them and accused Sandeepa Virk used fake e-commerce website for money laundering activities and she claimed to be the owner of hyboocare.com, a website claiming to sell FDA approved beauty products having its registered address at WZ-44/1, Street No.13, Krishna Puri, Krishna Park, Old Mahavir Nagar, Tilak Nagar, New Delhi, however, the products listed on the website were found to be fake. It is also the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that accused Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta and Sandeepa Virk have utilized the proceeds of crime generated from duping the complainant to acquire immovable properties and flat No.2103 situated in Mumbai was acquired jointly in the name of Amit Gupta @ Nageshwar Gupta, Sandeepa Virk and Kamla. It is also the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that the accused Sandeepa Virk had utilized the part of proceeds of crime directly and indirectly to finance her luxury life style, travel and for purchasing two additional immovable properties in Krishna Park, Tilak Nagar, New Delhi. It is also the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that the accused Sandeepa Virk has destroyed her mobile phone, which is the evidence in the present matter and she has committed an act of destruction of evidence. It is also the case of the Directorate of Enforcement that accused Sandeepa Virk has actively participated in the activities related to the offence of money laundering and she found to be knowingly and actually involved in the process of acquisition, possession and use of proceeds of crime and projecting or claiming it as untainted property and

accused persons have committed the offence of money laundering as defined u/s. 3 of the PMLA, 2002, punishable u/s 4 of the PMLA, 2002.

For the purpose of grant of bail, the twin conditions as mentioned in Section 45 PMLA have to be satisfied and the Court should be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the offence and accused is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. Proviso to Section 45 PMLA confers a discretion to the Court to grant bail where the accused is a woman. It is well settled law that proviso to section 45 PMLA clearly indicates that benefit of the said proviso to the category of the persons mentioned therein may be extended at the discretion of the Court considering the facts and circumstances of each case and could not be construed as a mandatory or obligatory on the part of the Court to release the accused on bail. For the purpose of grant of bail, the accused has to satisfy the triple tests and other parameters.

The present matter is at the stage of cognizance. In the present case, allegations against the accused persons are grave and serious in nature. If the accused is released on bail, there is possibility that accused may abscond or tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, gravity of offence and nature of serious allegations levelled against the accused, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground for regular bail of the accused Sandeepa Virk is made out. Accordingly, the present application for regular bail of the accused Sandeepa Virk is dismissed.

Case laws relied upon by counsel for the accused are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case for the purpose of grant of regular bail to the accused.

Nothing stated herein shall tantamount to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the present case and the

observations made in the present order are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail application.

Copy of this order be also sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for information. Copy of this order be also sent to the accused through concerned Jail Superintendent. Copy of this order be given dasti to counsel for the accused, if prayed for.

In terms of directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, cover-sheet mentioning the contact address and phone number of the legal services authority/ committee be appended with the copy of this order informing the accused about the availability of the free legal aid facilities for pursuing higher remedies.

Order be uploaded on the website of the Delhi District Court.

(Vijay Shankar)
ASJ-04, West District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
04/11/2025(B)