



2025:DHC:7754



\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% *Date of Decision: 03.09.2025*+ **BAIL APPLN. 3230/2025**

NEETU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar and Mr. Rajat
Kumar Bharti, Advs.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the
State with Mr. Ashish Priya
and Mr. Ajay Pratap Singh
Chauhan, Advs. along with SI
Pooja.
Mr Dhruva Bhagat, Adv. for
victim.**CORAM:****HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA****JUDGMENT****DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J. (Oral)****CRL.M.A. 25016/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25017/2025 (exemptions)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Applications stand disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 3230/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25015/2025

3. The applicant, by way of this application, seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 3230/2025, registered on 11.07.2025, at Police Station Ranjeet Nagar, Delhi for



the commission of offences punishable under Sections 316(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 [hereafter '*BNS*'].

4. Brief facts of the case are that the FIR in this case came to be registered on the complaint of the complainants – Dr. Indu Khurana and Dr. Pushpinder Khurana, Directors of Kailash Nursing Home Pvt. Ltd. – who alleged that the applicant Neetu was employed in 2019 as an OPD assistant/patient coordinator, while co-accused Vikas was later employed in 2023 as a front desk executive. Over time, Neetu gained the trust of the complainants and Dr. Isha Khurana, who entrusted her with the responsibility of collecting payments, issuing receipts, maintaining patient records, and handling billing software. It is alleged that the present applicant, in collusion with co-accused Vikas, began embezzling funds by misrepresenting cash payments received from patients as payments made through debit/credit card or UPI in the billing software. She is further alleged to have fabricated and forged receipts to conceal the misappropriation of money, and also to have stolen/cracked passwords to alter billing entries. On 28.06.2025, a patient named Mrs. Pallavi disclosed that she had already paid ₹50,000/- in cash to Neetu, even though the software showed it as a debit card transaction. Upon inquiry, Neetu allegedly admitted having received the amount. This raised suspicion, and subsequent scrutiny revealed several such entries, involving around 200 patients, where cash payments were shown as card/UPI transactions. The complainants further alleged that Neetu and Vikas fled the nursing home upon sensing exposure, but were later apprehended by police. During inquiry, co-accused Vikas allegedly



2025:DHC:7754



confessed to being in an affair with Neetu and admitted his role in the embezzlement. Missing OPD diaries containing sensitive patient records were also linked to them. It is alleged that the bank statements of Neetu allegedly revealed credits of about ₹55 lakhs, far beyond her monthly salary of ₹19,000/-, indicating siphoning of funds. Till date, the complainants estimate a misappropriation of approximately ₹27 lakhs, though the figure may rise as further records are scrutinized. On these allegations, the present FIR was registered against the applicant Neetu and co-accused Vikas for commission of offence under Section 316(4) of the BNS.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the applicant, a 26-year-old medical professional residing in Delhi since 2017, has an unblemished record and no prior criminal antecedents. It is argued that the present FIR is nothing but a result of vendetta and police abuse, as the applicant had confronted Dr. Isha Khurana on 28.06.2025 regarding some forged documents. Immediately thereafter, on 29.06.2025, the applicant was illegally detained in P.S. Ranjit Nagar without any formal arrest and subjected to custodial torture, harassment and even sexual misconduct for five consecutive days, in gross violation of her rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. It is further contended that during such illegal detention, police personnel, in connivance with one Manish Sharma who was introduced as an advocate, had extorted a sum of ₹13 lakhs from the applicant's family with the promise of "closing the case," which never materialised. The learned counsel further submits that the applicant thereafter lodged a detailed complaint with



2025:DHC:7754



senior police officers and the NHRC on 14.07.2025 narrating these illegal acts, and has also initiated proceedings under Section 173(3) of BNSS to place the said complaint before the concerned Magistrate. In these circumstances, it is argued that the applicant is being falsely implicated, is a victim of custodial torture, and deserves protection by way of anticipatory bail.

6. The learned APP for the State, assisted by the learned counsel for the victim/complainant, opposes the bail application and contends that the investigation is at an initial stage, and the bank transactions of the applicant are highly suspicious. It is submitted that her custodial interrogation is required to trace the source and trail of the large amounts reflected in her account. It is further contended that multiple transactions have been made to different persons, raising the possibility of involvement of other staff or outside individuals, which needs to be thoroughly investigated. The cheated amount is yet to be recovered, and custodial interrogation is also required for the same. Given the serious nature of allegations, the magnitude of embezzlement, and the stage of investigation, it is urged that the applicant does not deserve to be granted bail at this stage.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State, and has perused the records.

8. As per the FIR, the applicant Neetu, employed as an OPD assistant/patient coordinator at Kailash Nursing Home, was entrusted with the responsibility of collecting payments from patients, issuing



receipts, and maintaining billing records. It is specifically alleged that, after gaining the trust of the complainants and Dr. Isha Khurana, she had begun misappropriating cash payments by showing them in the software as debit/credit card or UPI transactions, and had further forged and fabricated receipts to conceal such embezzlement. It is also alleged that she had stolen or cracked the password of the billing software to alter entries and siphoned funds in collusion with co-accused Vikas. The incident had come to light when a patient had disclosed having paid ₹50,000/- in cash to Neetu, though the records reflected it as a card transaction. On further scrutiny, several similar transactions were detected involving about 200 patients.

9. As per status report, during the course of investigation, the I.O. had collected relevant documents from the hospital, including printed bills showing that while several patients had paid their bills in cash, the corresponding entries were reflected in the records as payments made through credit card, UPI or other digital modes. Statements of patients under Section 180 of BNSS were also recorded, many of whom confirmed having made cash payments. Some patients produced receipts, while others stated that the present applicant Neetu had not issued any receipt, giving excuses at the time of payment. The bank account statements of the applicant Neetu and co-accused Vikas were also obtained, which revealed transactions of ₹69,21,240/- in Neetu's account and ₹13,89,287/- in Vikas's account since their joining, and evidently, these figures are wholly disproportionate to their respective salaries. Further, statements of individuals such as Madan Lal and Subhash were recorded, who



disclosed that the present applicant Neetu had regularly handed over cash to them and instructed them to deposit the amounts into her bank account through online transfer. The I.O. has also placed before this Court the copies of statements of witnesses recorded under Section 180 of BNSS as well as the bank account statements, as noted above, which have been perused by this Court.

10. Having considered the material on record and the submissions advanced, this Court finds that the allegations against the applicant are grave and serious in nature, involving large-scale embezzlement of funds from the hospital where she was employed. The nature and volume of such transactions, spread across different accounts and individuals, requires custodial interrogation to trace the complete money trail, identify other possible persons involved, and effect recovery of the cheated amount.

11. It is further borne out from the record that, as alleged, three OPD diaries containing confidential patient information, including names, ages, addresses, UHID numbers and contact details, are alleged to be missing, which allegedly were in the custody of the applicant and co-accused Vikas. There is strength in the argument of the State that recovery of such diaries is of critical importance, not only for the purposes of investigation but also to safeguard the confidentiality of sensitive patient data. The custodial interrogation of the applicant is, therefore, necessary in the given facts and circumstances of the case.

12. Insofar as the applicant's allegations of illegal detention,



custodial torture, extortion and sexual misconduct by police officers are concerned, it is pertinent to note that the applicant has already approached the NHRC by way of a complaint dated 14.07.2025. As those grievances are being pursued separately before the appropriate forum and cannot be examined within the limited scope of the present bail application, which is to be decided on its own merit. As regards the contention that the applicant and her family members were compelled to pay a sum of ₹13 lakhs for “closing the case”, this Court finds the submission wholly unconvincing. If the applicant genuinely believed that the present case was false and fabricated, there is no plausible explanation as to why she or her family would part with such a substantial amount instead of seeking remedies in accordance with law. Such a stand, rather than strengthening her case, casts serious doubts on the *bona fides* of her plea. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in such arguments advanced on behalf of the applicant, especially in view of the observations in proceeding paragraphs and the material unearthed during investigation so far.

13. In this Court’s view, grant of anticipatory bail at this stage would hamper the ongoing investigation, which is at a nascent stage. It is also not in dispute that proceedings under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. have already been initiated against the applicant.

14. In view of the foregoing circumstances, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

15. The bail application is accordingly dismissed.

16. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove



2025:DHC:7754



shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

17. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 03, 2025/ns

T.D.

This is a Court CopyTM of the judgment as appearing on the Court website.
Downloaded from www.manupatra.com