

\$~17

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1756/2016**

MAHENDER YADAV

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Ashok K. Singh, Mr. R.
Rastogi, Ms. Vinita Singh, Mr.
Pawan Chowdhary, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ravi Nayak, APP with SI
Sombit Burari.
Mr. Rohit Kaul, Adv. for
complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

03.10.2016

%

1. By the present petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 457/2015 under Sections 406/420/468/471 IPC registered at PS Burari on the complaint of Suraj Prakash.

2. Complainant Suraj Prakash in the FIR alleged that he was owner of a house bearing Khasra No.29/2/3 measuring 50 sq.yds. and had purchased the same from one Ram Pyare vide general power of attorney dated 30th December, 1996 and was residing in the said house at ground floor and the second floor was given to the petitioner for residing, however no rent was

BAIL APPLN. 1756/2016

page 1 of 3

charged as the petitioner and his wife used to take care of the meals of the complainant. On 15th February, 2015 since the complainant was not feeling well and the petitioner and his wife were not taking care, he called his sister who took him to her house. Later it was revealed that the petitioner prepared forged documents of the property claiming himself to be the owner having purchased it from one Ram Pyare Yadav who was the owner of the property in 1993. The complainant further alleged that in the year 2008 the petitioner had got electricity connection installed in the house, taken Rs.6000/- from him and got his signatures on some applications, forms and affidavits which he later came to know were fraudulently used for taking electricity connection in the name of the complainant.

3. During the course of investigation statement of previous owner of property Ram Pyare Yadav was recorded who stated that he had sold the property to the complainant and not to the petitioner. Further the petitioner was not also able to show the original documents in his favour.

4. The petitioner is in custody since 7th July, 2016 and as per the status report the investigation is complete and charge-sheet is likely to be filed in the first week of October, 2016.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner is no more required for custodial interrogation as the investigation is complete and the charge-sheet is to be filed shortly, I deem it fit to grant bail to the petitioner. It is therefore directed that the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with two sureties of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court further subject to the condition that he will not leave the country without the prior permission of

the Court concerned.

6. Petition is disposed of. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

OCTOBER 03, 2016
‘ga’