

\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ BAIL APPLN. 1920/2015

SUDESH CHODUHARY @ CHOTRA Petitioner
Through: Mr.Raj Kumar Rajput, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE & ANR Respondents
Through: Mr.M.P.Singh, APP.
Ms.Shriya Maini, Advocate for the
complainant.
SI Naveen Kumar, P.S.Hauz Khas.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

% **ORDER**
23.11.2015

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No.942/2015 (P.S.Hauz Khas) instituted for the offences under Sections 323/452/384/506 IPC.

The complainant is a fruit vendor and offers juices of fruits to his customers. The petitioner is also a shop keeper of the area.

Over the issue as to who should be served fruit juice first: the petitioner or some other customer, a fight took place leading to the institution of the present case.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the dispute between the parties has already been settled.

The petitioner was granted interim protection by order dated

14.09.2015, whereafter he visited the police station for participating in the investigation.

Mr.M.P.Singh, APP seriously opposes the confirmation of anticipatory bail on the ground that the complainant is still apprehensive of threats from the petitioner.

The complainant is present in person. He has however admitted that after the institution of the case, there has not been any instance when he has been troubled by the petitioner.

Let it be made clear that if any such report comes in future against the petitioner, the matter shall be viewed seriously by the officer incharge of the concerned police station and necessary criminal action would be taken against him.

After having said that, considering the nature of accusation, settlement of dispute between the parties and the assurance on behalf of the petitioner that he would not repeat such act of vandalism in future, this Court confirms the provisional anticipatory bail which was granted to the petitioner.

The petitioner shall be allowed to remain on bail on the same bond till the conclusion of the case.

Application is allowed.

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

NOVEMBER 23, 2015

k