

\$~16

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 696/2017**

CHARANJEET SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Siddharth Joshi, Adv. with
Mr.Vaibhav Jain, Adv.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Arun Kumar Sharma, APP.
Insp. Badruddin Khan, DIU/NED.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORDER

% **07.07.2017**

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with FIR No.299/2014 dated 08.07.2014 (PS Sonia Vihar) instituted for the offences under sections 420/448/451/452/467/468/471/120B/506 of the IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, stated that despite the case having been instituted under the aforesaid sections, charges now have been framed only under sections 448/420/471 of the IPC. Apart from this, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there is no tangible material collected during the course of investigation against the petitioner. He has further submitted that though a list of 47 cases against him has been provided by the prosecution but out of those 47 cases, in about 42 cases, the petitioner has either been discharged or acquitted.

One Lalit Kumar Tayal filed a case against his caretaker Anil Kumar

who is alleged to have been in cahoots with some of the accused persons and he got the land of the complainant transferred in favour of others.

During the course of investigation, it transpired that some part of the land was transferred in the name of wife of the petitioner and that the petitioner was a bad character of the area who manipulated the land records in the case.

Be that as it may, taking into account the facts that chargesheet in the case has been submitted, charges have been framed and that the petitioner has remained in custody since 16.09.2016, this Court is inclined to grant bail to him.

The petitioner is directed to be released on bail, on his furnishing a bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall promptly participate in the trial and any attempt on his part to evade the process of trial would invite adverse inference. In that event, it would be open for the state to seek cancellation of the bail granted to the petitioner.

The application is disposed of.

Dasti.

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

JULY 07, 2017
ab