

\$~3

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 432/2017

RAM SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajat Wadhwa, Adv.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Chauhan, APP for
State with SI Devender, Crime
Branch.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

17.07.2017

Learned APP for the State submits that during the investigation it is revealed that ₹40,50,200/- on 3rd September, 2016 and ₹15,20,300/- on 5th September, 2016 were credited in the accounts of two firms namely M/s Raj Enterprises and M/s IVD Services. Later on, these amounts were withdrawn from the said accounts. Beneficiary of the account, as per the RTGS remitter, was Raj Kumar Goel who was arrested. He disclosed the name of Rakesh @ Mehndi Hasan. Accordingly, Rakesh @ Mehndi Hasan was arrested who disclosed the name of Jitender Singh @ Jitu. Later on, co-accused Jitender Singh @ Jitu disclosed the name of the petitioner. Jitender Singh @ Jitu stated that forged cheques were prepared by the petitioner in lieu of hefty sum out of ₹15 lacs received by him. A raid was conducted at

the house of petitioner but he managed to escape. On identification of Jitender Singh @ Jitu, one bag of petitioner was recovered from his house. From the said bag, 8 fake Adhar Cards, 2 PAN cards, 3 cheques of Cooperative Bank were recovered. It is submitted that petitioner is also suspected to be involved in another FIR 207/2016 of similar nature of police station Cannaught Place. It is submitted that custodial interrogation is required to unearth the whole racket.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated. Petitioner is not involved in the FIR No. 207/16. He is also not involved in this case as well. The cheated amount has already been recovered. Except the statement of co-accused no other material is there with the investigator to show the complicity of petitioner. Petitioner has cooperated in the investigation and is not required for custodial interrogation.

Keeping in mind serious allegations as aforesaid, I am not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to petitioner. Application is dismissed.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JULY 17, 2017

ga