

\$~16

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1395/2016 & CRL.M.A.No.10559/16**

RAJEEV NAG

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr.Manoranjan Kumar, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through : Mr.Akshai Malik, APP.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.P.GARG

ORDER

%

19.10.2016

1. The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.400/2014 registered under Sections 420/467/468/464/471/120B IPC at PS Lajpat Nagar. Status report is on record.

2. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties including the complainant's daughters and have examined the file. It is relevant to note that the complainant has since expired.

3. On perusal of the status report, it reveals that there are serious allegations against the petitioner whereby he attempted to grab the valuable property of the complainant by impersonating him as Sandeep. The petitioner allegedly took complainant's signatures fraudulently on various papers on the pretext to get the property 'freehold'. On payment of ₹15 lacs allegedly, he attempted to get the

BAIL APPLN. 1395/2016

page 1 of 2

possession of the property without making remaining payment whatsoever as contained in the alleged memorandum of understanding on a stamp paper of ₹100. The petitioner even filed a civil suit for eviction of one Ram Partap Mishra. Strange enough, the complainant was impleaded only a performa defendant No.2. Subsequently, the suit was withdrawn against him. The defendant No.1 Ram Partap Sharma purportedly entered into a compromise with the petitioner and handed over the so-called possession of the property in question to him. During investigation, the petitioner failed to produce on record any receipt showing payment of ₹15 lacs in cash to the complainant.

4. Status report further reveals that petitioner could not be traced despite various visits to the address given in the petition and proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. have been initiated against him.

5. Considering the gravity and serious allegations against the petitioner, it is not a case for grant of anticipatory bail. The bail application is dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

6. Order '*dasti*.'

S.P.GARG, J.

OCTOBER 19, 2016 / tr