



2026:DHC:6584



\$~6

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 12.08.2026

#

CNR No. DLHC010334092026

+

BAIL APPLN. 2943/2026 & CRL.M.A. 22190/2026

NIKITA MISHRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Surya Nath Pandey, Advocate
(through video conferencing)

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State.
Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. Advocate
with counsel for complainant *de facto*
(appearance not given)**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. The orders passed today in previous two calls are extracted below:

1. *The accused/applicant seeks interim protection/anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 427/2026 of PS Seemapuri for offence under Section 319(2)/318(4)/336(3)/339/61(2) BNS.*
2. *The status report was returned under objections, so the same is submitted by learned APP and is accepted across the board.*
2. *After addressing partly, learned counsel for accused/applicant seeks pass over to obtain instructions if the present anticipatory bail application is to be pressed.*
3. *As requested, be awaited.*

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J**AUGUST 12, 2026/ry**



2026:DHC:6584



4. In the midst of board, matter again taken up. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that he has instructions of the accused/applicant to press this anticipatory bail application.

5. Matter is passed over to be heard after conclusion of the remaining urgent matters.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

AUGUST 12, 2026/dr

2. In this third call, I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State as well as learned senior counsel for complainant *de facto*. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 427/2026 of PS Seemapuri for offence under Section 319(2) /318(4) /336(3)/339 /61(2) BNS.

3. The FIR in this case was registered on the complaint of father-in-law of the accused/applicant, who narrated in detail the manner in which he was defrauded by the accused/applicant at various stages. The FIR describes various stages of matrimonial relationship between the accused/applicant and son of the complainant *de facto*, at which stages the complainant *de facto* was made to part away with substantial money, but those facts are not relevant for present purposes. Limited to the present purpose, the allegation against the accused/applicant is as follows. The accused/applicant got married with son of the complainant *de facto* and thereafter, she started living separately in Gurugram under the pretext that she had been selected as Additional District Magistrate, Himachal Pradesh, so she was under training and could not meet even her husband. According to prosecution, the



accused/applicant started living with one Vaibhav Tyagi as a live-in partner. Further, according to prosecution, the accused/applicant even forged a notification of her appointment, claiming it to have been issued by the Chief Secretary to the Government of Himachal Pradesh. The accused/applicant transmitted over WhatsApp not just the forged appointment notification, but also forged car stickers depicting her as ADM, Lahaul and Spiti, HP in order to convince the complainant *de facto* and others that she had been appointed as ADM. On the basis of those forged documents, the accused/applicant started making the complainant *de facto* pay her money on different pretexts in installments, which ultimately was to the total tune of approximately Rs.39,00,000/-, and she further transferred the said money to her friends. The accused/applicant also got sent to the complainant *de facto* various emails through co-accused Anupam Kashyap conveying an impression that the Hon'ble Chief Justice of Himachal Pradesh High Court (*named as a Judge of that Court*) also had to meet her but could not. In order to make the complainant *de facto* believe her claims, she also got sent emails from co-accused Anupam Kashyap to the extent that wife of one of Hon'ble Judges of Himachal Pradesh High Court had met with a serious accident and even a photograph of the accident was mailed.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that she is innocent and has been falsely involved in this case. It is contended that the FIR nowhere alleges that the complainant *de facto* paid any money to the accused/applicant. It is submitted that even according to the FIR, the money



paid by the complainant *de facto* was towards bribe for ensuring that the accused/applicant gets job of a civil servant or a judge and that being so, it is he who is guilty of wrong. Learned counsel for accused/applicant also submits that the transmission of notification of appointment of the accused/applicant as ADM, Himachal Pradesh from her mobile phone to the mobile phone of the complainant *de facto* occurred because her mobile phone was hacked.

5. Learned APP strongly opposes the anticipatory bail application on the ground that the allegations in the FIR are extremely serious and custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant is required in order to unearth the exact expanse of the crime by way of finding out as to who else helped her in forging the letter heads, seals and signatures of officers of the Himachal Pradesh Government on which her appointment notification was forged by the accused/applicant.

6. Learned Senior Counsel for complainant *de facto* also strongly opposes the anticipatory bail application, submitting that in order to pressurize the complainant *de facto*, the accused/applicant went to the extent of alleging that he had raped her many years ago.

7. So far as the contention of the learned counsel for the accused/applicant that no money was paid to her, the same is contrary to the contents of the FIR.



2026:DHC:6584



8. The larger question in the present case is not just the fraud allegedly played by the accused/applicant in falsely representing herself as ADM, but the manner in which she arranged the means to forge not just the appointment notification, but also the letter heads, the seals and the signatures of the concerned officer of Himachal Pradesh Government. Also, as reflected from FIR, the accused/applicant forged the car stickers representing herself as ADM, Himachal Pradesh, which also need to be investigated into.

9. In view of the overall circumstances, I do not find requirement expressed by the IO for custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant to be unjustified. It would certainly be necessary to carry out custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant. Therefore, this anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 12, 2026/ry