

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
+ BAIL APPLN. 1900/2016
ARNAB GANGULY Petitioner

versus

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

% **19.10.2016**

Learned counsel for petitioner submits that prosecutrix was working in the same organization where petitioner was working. Prosecutrix was in relationship with petitioner. Learned counsel for petitioner further submits that photographs indicating, that prosecutrix was in relationship with petitioner, have been placed on record at pages from 56 to 63. He further submits that e-mails were exchanged between the parties and the same have been placed on record at pages 68 to 84. It is further submitted that petitioner has been falsely implicated. Though prosecutrix has alleged in the FIR that petitioner had taken her picture and was blackmailing her but no such

photographs have been recovered during the investigation. Charge has already been framed. Examination in chief of prosecutrix has also been recorded.

Learned additional public prosecutor has opposed the bail application. It is contended that prosecutrix was working in the same office. Petitioner had taken her to his house one day and gave water to drink, thereafter, she became drowsy. After 15-20 minutes, she noticed the string of her pajama untied.

I have heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned additional public prosecutor and have perused the photographs and e-mails placed on record.

Keeping in mind the totality of facts and circumstances, petitioner is admitted to bail upon his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of trial court.

Application is disposed of in the above terms.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

OCTOBER 19, 2016/dk