$~12

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 663/2016

SUNIL KUMAR ..... Petitioner
Represented by: Mr.N.K. Chahar, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) ..... Respondent
Represented by: Mr. Kewal Singh Ahuja, APP for State along with SI Manoj Singh, PS Mehrauli.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

O R D E R

% 29.07.2016

By this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 654/2016 registered under Sections 323/354D/506/509 IPC at P.S. Mehrauli.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the complainant was widow of the cousin brother of the petitioner. She was aware of the marital status of the petitioner. It is evident from the photographs placed on record that both of them were in a consented relationship. Since the petitioner was not in a position to take divorce and marry the complainant, she lodged the above noted FIR.

Learned APP for the State submits that as directed by this court vide order dated 6th April, 2016, the photographs and the transcripts of the conversations recorded, which have been placed on record, have been verified to be true. .Verification has been done from the hotel, where the petitioner and complainant stayed on 6th July, 2015.

The allegations of the complainant against the petitioner are that 10th March, 2016, when she was coming back from class, she saw the petitioner standing outside her flat having bottle of acid in his hand and he threatened her that if she did not talk to him, he would harm her. She somehow managed to escape and bolted the door from inside, whereafter the petitioner knocked the door number of times. When she made noise, the neighbours came and the petitioner fled away. According to the complainant, the petitioner was pressurising her for friendship for the last one year, which she ignored.

From a perusal of the photographs, the chats between the parties and the fact that with consent they lived in a hotel together, it is apparent that the petitioner and respondent No.2 were friendly with each other for the past few months. The complainant is the widow of cousin brother of the petitioner and knew about the marital status of the petitioner.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. In the event of arrest, the petitioner will be released on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹20,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer of the Police Station concerned and further subject to the petitioner joining the investigation as and when directed by the Investigating Office and that he will not leave the country without the prior permission of the court concerned.

Dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

JULY 29, 2016 / 'n'