

3

\$~12-14

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ BAIL APPLN. 1210/2010

SHAKTI SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas K. Bharti, Advocate

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Gupta, APP for the State with  
Mr. Jasbir, SI PS Kapeshera

+ BAIL APPLN. 1211/2010

SURENDER SINGH @ SURENDER SOLANKI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas K. Bharti, Advocate

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Gupta, APP for the State with  
Mr. Jasbir, SI PS Kapeshera

+ BAIL APPLN. 1212/2010

NAMITA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas K. Bharti, Advocate

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Gupta, APP for the State with  
Mr. Jasbir, SI PS Kapeshera

**CORAM:**

**JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA**

**ORDER**

**27.10.2010**


%

This application has been made for anticipatory bail by the

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AMULYA  
Certify that the digital file and  
physical file have been compared and  
the digital data is as per the physical  
file and no page is missing.

applicant/petitioner who is involved in a case of cheating and breach of trust. It is alleged that petitioner entered into an agreement to sell with the complainant. The agreement to sell placed on record shows that the petitioner had received a cash of Rs.9,20,000/-. It may be an issue of investigation by the investigating agency as to wherefrom the complainant got this cash amount but that does not absolve the criminal act, committed by the petitioner. Two Wrongs do not make one Right. It is also a fact that against receipt of cash of Rs.9,20,000/- a cheque was issued by the accused to the complainant of Rs.9,20,000/- and an FIR of loss of cheque-book was lodged by him after registration of FIR by the complainant. No cheque would have been issued by the accused to the complainant for a sum of Rs.9,20,000/- unless cash had been received by him. It is also a fact that the complainant had paid two installments of the property in question, which was to be purchased by the complainant. I consider that under these circumstances, it is a fit case for custodial interrogation. The petitions/application for anticipatory bail is hereby dismissed.



SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA,J

OCTOBER 27, 2010  
vn