

26# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 79/2017**

PRADEEP PANDEY

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate.**

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Ms. Meenakshi Chauhan, APP
for the State with SI Chandan
and ASI Maheshwar, PS Okhla
Industrial Area.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

17.01.2017

%

1. By the present petition the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 675/2016 under Sections 354/354B/354D/506/509 IPC registered at PS Okhla Industrial Area.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the first alleged incident took place on 28th December, 2016, however, no FIR was lodged on 29th December, 2016. Further the version of the prosecutrix is concocted for the reason that she was not walking alone but with her husband and father after closing the shop. Thus there would not be much of a distance between three of them and the petitioner could not have committed the offence.

3. The allegations of the prosecutrix in the FIR are that on 28th December, 2016 at about 8.30 PM when she was going towards her jhuggi after purchasing milk, the petitioner caught hold of her hand, tried to press

BAIL APPLN. 79/2017

Page 1 of 2

her mouth and expressed his love for her. When she refused he started hurling filthy abuses and threatened her. She went to her jhuggi after freeing herself and told the incident to her husband and parents. On the next day again on 29th December, 2016 when she was working at the shop of her mother at Churia Mohalla, Tehkhand she saw the petitioner roaming near the shop. She told this fact to her husband and mother. After duty her father also came to the shop. At about 9.30 PM when all of them were going towards the jhuggi after closing the shop she was ahead of her husband and parents. When she reached near the Bank of India, the petitioner was standing there alone with his Honda Car DL 1N 7754, gray colour. The petitioner caught hold of her hand and stated that he had brought new clothes for her and she should sit in the car. She refused and tried to free herself. In the meantime, her husband and parents came there when the petitioner left.

4. Considering the allegations of repeated acts on part of the petitioner, this Court finds no reason to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Bail application is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

JANUARY 17, 2017

‘vn’