

10# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 898/2016**

SAJID ANSARI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Sood, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Kumar Ranjan, Mr. Dilip
Raghuvanshi and Mr. Siddharth
Gupta, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Neelam Sharma, APP for the
State with Inspector Jaishree, PS
Paharganj.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

21.07.2016

%

By this petition the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0170/2016 under Sections 376/313/354/506/34 IPC registered at PS Paharganj, Delhi.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that no role for offence punishable under Section 376 IPC has been attributed to the petitioner even if the FIR is taken on its face value. He further states that the allegations against the petitioner are false and he has been implicated in a matrimonial dispute being a friend of the husband of the complainant. Rahul, the main accused, husband of the complainant has already been granted anticipatory bail.

Learned APP for the State has taken me through the status report and

BAIL APPLN. 898/2016

Page 1 of 2

the FIR.

The allegations in the FIR are that Nikhil promised to marry the complainant and finally they were married on 25th August, 2008 in which Rahul was a witness to the marriage. However, Nikhil remained with her only for one day and thereafter left her. Since Nikhil did not join the company of the complainant and his whereabouts were not known, the marriage with him ended because of the gap of eight years. Thereafter Rahul expressed his willingness to marry the complainant. They married on 2nd March, 2016 and thereafter stayed in different hotels in Delhi. Rahul pressurised the complainant to establish relationship with his friends. However, the allegations against the petitioner Sajid Ansari are not of establishing physical relation but of touching the complainant with bad intentions. Considering, the fact that the allegations against the petitioner are for offence punishable under Section 354 IPC, I deem it fit to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

It is, therefore, directed that in the event of arrest, the petitioner will 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 the petitioner will join the investigation as and when directed by the Investigating Officer.

Petition is disposed of. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

JULY 21, 2016/‘vn’

BAIL APPLN. 898/2016

Page 2 of 2