

\$~70.

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 410/2017**

SURENDRA SINGH @ TONY

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. O.S. Gupta, Adv.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Katyal, APP with ASI
Rajender

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER
07.03.2017

%

Crl. M.A. No. 3937/2017

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 410/2017

The petitioner has preferred the present anticipatory bail application apprehending arrest in case FIR 784/2016 u/s 420/406/34 IPC registered at PS Tilak Nagar. The submission of counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has been wrongfully roped in the present case merely because the petitioner had accompanied his friend Gurvinder Singh @ Sonu, who is the nephew of the complainant for the purpose of depositing cash of Rs.60 lacs

belonging to the complainant on account of demonetisation.

The further submission of counsel for the petitioner is that the name of the bank is not mentioned in the FIR. He submits that it is Gurvinder Singh who had knowledge about the complainant being in possession of Rs.60 lacs cash in denomination of 500 and 1000, who has intended to misappropriate the said amount and the petitioner had no role in the same.

Mr. Katyal, who appears for the State, states that NBWs have already been issued against the petitioner since he is evading arrest in the case and he has not joined the investigation till date. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner has been rejected thrice by the Trial Court in the present case. He points out that one Javed who is also a co-accused in the case has also disclosed the name of the petitioner as the person involved in the offence during his interrogation.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, perused the FIR and heard Mr. Katyal, I am not inclined to grant relief to the petitioner. For the effective investigation of this case, which involves misappropriation of Rs.60 lacs belonging to an old lady complainant, it is necessary to unearth the complete money trail and conspiracy for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. Dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

MARCH 07, 2017

sr