

\$~35.

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 63/2017**

RAJESH ROSHAN SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manoj Khatri, Advocate

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Katyal, APP

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER

%

16.01.2017

Crl. M.A. No. 754/2017

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

Bail Application No. 63/2017

Issue notice. Mr. Katyal accepts notice. He has tendered in Court the reply to the anticipatory bail application which has been taken on record. Copy has been served on counsel for the petitioner.

The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. There is nothing to connect the petitioner to the alleged offence. The reply tendered in court by the State shows that one Truck No. NL-02 L 8068 was recovered at the instance of accused Sanjay Kumar which had a tampered chassis number and which had been

got re-registered from Nagaland by upgrading the model. Sanjay Kumar has disclosed the name of Sanjay Singh @ Rajesh Roshan Singh as the person who had got the said tampering and registration done at Nagaland. He has disclosed that Sanjay Singh @ Rajesh Roshan Singh is conducting his business as Bedi Transport located at Shop No. TS-13, Regulated Market, Malaguri, Siliguru, West Bengal, having flat No. 45/5, IIIrd Floor, Champa Shri More, Pardhan Nagar, Siliguri, West Bengal. Attempts to apprehend the petitioner have failed since he had been found to be absconding. Non-bailable warrants were also issued against the petitioner. His wife was confronted and she stated that petitioner has gone somewhere for work.

Though, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is not known by the name of Sanjay Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the fact that it is the petitioner who is carrying on business as Bedi Transport. Mr. Katyal further submits that investigation has shown that the petitioner had received Rs. 25,000/- twice for re-registration of the Truck at Nagaland in his account, particulars whereof have been mentioned in the reply. He further states that proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. have also been initiated against the petitioner.

In these circumstances, I am not inclined to grant any protection to the petitioner. Dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

JANUARY 16, 2017

sl