

1#\$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 811/2016**

ANJUM KHANNA

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr. C.P. Malik, Advocate.**

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for the
State with Inspector Usha
Sharma and Inspector Rajesh
Barar/SHO, Hari Nagar.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

01.09.2016

%

1. By the present petition the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.347/2016 under Sections 376/506 IPC registered at PS Hari Nagar, Delhi.

2. The allegations by the complainant in the FIR are that the petitioner used to drop her from the office everyday and told her that his relations with his wife were not cordial. It is alleged that on 18th April, 2014 when the mother of the prosecutrix was not at home, the petitioner made physical relationship with her all on the pretext of marrying her after taking divorce from his wife.

3. It is also alleged that since the petitioner was the Vice-President of the company and the prosecutrix the Assistant Manager, she was taken to Bangalore, the tickets whereof were also booked by the petitioner and

BAIL APPLN. 811/2016

Page 1 of 3

physical relations were established.

4. The case of the petitioner is that the complainant had taken a loan from the petitioner and after his transfer from Delhi to Bangalore when he demanded back the money, the complainant filed the present complaint. Learned counsel for the petitioner also states that the Memorandum of Understanding was also arrived at wherein the complainant agreed to return the amount however, instead of doing the same she filed the complaint.

5. A detailed status report was called from the DCP, West District wherein though initially the complainant stated that the money given by the petitioner to her was in return of an advance given by the complainant however, later when bank transactions were confronted she admitted that she had taken a sum of ₹1.50 lakhs from the petitioner. Verifications were also done from the hotel Royal Orchid, Bangalore from 15th May, 2014 to 23rd May, 2014 wherein the petitioner and the complainant resided and the bill was paid by the petitioner. As regards the payment of the air tickets made, the same is being verified. From the call detail records it is evident that there were regular conversation and messages between the complainant and wife of the petitioner Mona Katyal. The emails between the petitioner's wife dated 27th October, 2015, 28th October, 2015, 29th October, 2015, 30th October, 2015 and 5th November, 2015 also noted that she was demanding the money back from the complainant which her husband had given to her.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, I deem it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. It is, therefore, directed that in the event of arrest the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in

the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ SHO concerned, further subject to the condition that he will join the investigation as and when directed by the Investigating Officer and will not leave the country without prior permission of the learned Trial Court.

7. Petition is disposed of.

8. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

SEPTEMBER 01, 2016

‘vn’