

4# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 138/2017**

**SATISH CHAND**

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr.O.P. Aggarwal, Advocate.**

versus

**STATE**

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Mr. Ravi Nayak, APP for the  
State with Inspector Jaswant  
Sing, PS Harsh Vihar.**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA**

**ORDER**

**20.03.2017**

%

1. By the present petition the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.639/2014 under Sections 419/420/468/471 IPC registered at PS Harsh Vihar, Delhi on the complaint of Suresh Ram Gupta.

2. In the complaint the complainant alleged that he was introduced to the present petitioner by a property dealer named Ramesh Chand Khurana. The petitioner represented himself to be the owner and in possession of the property measuring 60 sq. Yards out of Khasra No.19/24, 19/25, Village Mandoli, Shahdara, Delhi. Agreement to Sell was entered into for a total sum of ₹30 lakhs out of which the complainant paid ₹3 lakhs. In view of the agreement complainant was given the Ikraranama, dated 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2010 duly thumb impressed by the petitioner and signed by two witnesses. Statement of the two witnesses who had signed the Ikrarnama had also been

***BAIL APPLN. 138/2017***

***Page 1 of 2***

recorded who stated that the petitioner took the earnest money of ₹3 lakhs.

3. Considering the material on record, this Court does not find it to be a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Bail application is dismissed.

**MUKTA GUPTA, J.**

**MARCH 20, 2017**

**‘vn’**