

RC 0032025A0060,CBI,ACB, Delhi
u/sec. 61 (2) of BNS and Section 7 of PC Act, 1988 (as amended
in 2018).
CBI vs. Renu Soni & Ors.

18.10.2025

The present matter/applications have been assigned by the Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, (PC Act) (CBI), Rouse Avenue Courts, Delhi vide order dated 18.10.2025 being the 2nd Link of the concerned court.

Present : Mr. M. Saraswat, Sr. PP for CBI with IO Inspr. Sanjay Malhotra.

Accused Vikas Bharti and Renu Soni produced in police custody.

Sh. Sanjay Dewan, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Sahil Munjal, Id. Counsels for accused Vikas Bharti.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta and Mr. Atul Tanwar, Id. Counsels for accused Renu Soni.

This is an application seeking judicial custody of accused Ms. Renu Soni and accused Vikas Bharti. Bail applications have also been filed on behalf of both the accused persons.

Heard.

As per record, the present case was registered on 16.10.2025 against Ms. Renu Soni, Jr. Law Officer, MCD and Sh. Vikas Bharti, Ahlmad, MCD Court No. 29, Tis Hazari Courts Complex, New Delhi U/s 61 (2) BNS, 2023 & Section 7 of PC Act (as amended in 2018) on the basis of a complaint dated 16.10.2025

of Sh. Rakesh Aggarwal R/o B-6, Gulaab Bagh, Nawada, Main Najafgarh Raod, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi-59.

It has been alleged in the complaint that the complainant had been residing at B-6, Gulaab Bagh, Nawada, Main Najafgarh Raod, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi, for past six months but on 29.09.2025, his aforesaid property was sealed by MCD officials, West Zone, Rajori Garden, New Delhi.

It has been further alleged that on 15.10.2025, the complainant visited the Court No. 29, Appellate Tribunal (A.T.), MCD, situated at Tis Hazari Court Complex, Delhi, for filing an application for de-sealing of his above said property and obtaining a stay order against demolition. During his visit, the complainant met Sh. Vikas Bharti, Ahlmad, Court No. 29, who informed the complainant that Ms. Renu Soni, Junior Law Officer, MCD, would help him in getting the de-sealing of his house and stay order against the demolition. However, for this purpose, he has to pay bribe amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- to her. Sh. Vikas Bharti, Ahlmad, further informed the complainant that in case the complainant failed to pay the demanded bribe amount, Ms. Renu Soni, Junior Law Officer would ensure that the stay and de-sealing orders would not be granted to the complainant.

It has also been alleged that Shri Vikas Bharti also provided the complainant mobile number of Ms. Renu Soni (Mob. XXXXXXXXXX) and instructed him to meet her the next day.

Since the complainant did not want to pay bribe money of Rs. 1,00,000/- to Ms. Renu Soni, Jr. Law Officer, MCD and Sh.

Vikas Bharti Ahlmad, he has submitted the said complaint to SP, CBI, ACB, Delhi for taking legal action against them.

That the verification of the said complaint was carried out by Sh. Rahul, Inspector alongwith Sh. Mohit Kumar, SI in the presence of independent witness Sh. Balram, MTS, office of Executive Engineer, CD-14, CPWD, East Block-4, R.K. Puram, Sector-01, New Delhi-66 (IW-1). The verification revealed the demand of bribe of Rs. 60,000/- on the part of Ms. Renu Soni, Jr. Law Officer, MCD and Sh. Vikas Bharti, Ahlmad, at MCD, New Delhi. On the basis of the complaint and verification report, the instant case was registered.

That during the course of investigation accused Sh. Vikas Bharti, Ahlmad on behalf of Ms. Renu Soni, Junior Law Officer was caught red handed while demanding and accepting illegal gratification of Rs. 60,000/- from the complainant. The said bribe amount was recovered from the possession of accused Sh. Vikas Bharti in the presence of independent witnesses.

That during the course of investigation accused Vikas Bharti and Ms. Renu Soni was arrested in the present case.

The IO has filed the application seeking 14 days judicial custody of both the accused persons with submission that investigation is at initial stage and important witnesses are to be examined and documents are to be collected.

Both the accused persons have filed separate bail applications. Let copies be supplied to IO who shall be at liberty to file reply on or before next date of hearing.

Ld. Counsel for accused Renu Soni has pressed for interim bail with submission that accused Renu Soni is having two children i.e. five year old daughter and eight months old son to take care. It is submitted that the son of the accused Renu is of tender age i.e. around eight months old and he is dependent upon his mother for mother's feed. Further that the son of the accused is also suffering from acute pneumonia and is undergoing treatment for the same. It is also stated that the applicant is residing alongwith her husband and two small children in a nuclear family and there is no female member at her residence to look after the infant child namely Jai Gupta. Copies of medical documents of the child are placed on record.

The request for interim bail is opposed on behalf of CBI as well the complainant who is present in court.

I have carefully perused the record in light of submissions made before me.

So far as the application filed by CBI for judicial custody is concerned, the accused persons were produced before the Ld. Special Judge on 17.10.2025 and a satisfaction regarding compliance of relevant rules and procedure was duly recorded and the accused persons were sent to CBI custody till today. Considering the overall facts and circumstances, the accused persons are sent to **judicial custody till 27.10.2025**.

As far as the request for interim bail made on behalf of accused Renu is concerned, considering the nature of allegations against the applicant and the fact that the investigation is at very

initial stage as accused persons have been arrested on 17.10.2025 only, I am of the considered view that there are no sufficient grounds for grant of interim bail to the applicant Renu Soni. There are other family members to look after the children. The issues raised by the applicant can be considered in better manner after obtaining a formal response/reply from the CBI who has also to verify the facts mentioned in the present application by the applicant.

So, in the given facts and circumstances the bail applications filed by the accused persons are adjourned for further consideration for **20.10.2025** and the same be accordingly put before the Ld. Special Judge/Duty Judge on that day.

In the meantime, reply may be filed by CBI.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

(SANJAY JINDAL)
Special Judge (PC Act) (CBI)-10
Rouse Avenue Courts Complex
New Delhi/18.10.2025(pk)