

\$~22.

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3964/2016

SEERAT ARORA (THR. HER MOTHER SMT. ARTI ARORA)

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Santosh Pratap, Adv.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) &ORS.

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Katyal, APP with ASI
Sumita, PS Jagatpuri
Mr. Ujjwal Puri, Adv. for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER

17.03.2017

%

On the last date, the CCTV footage which was referred to in the status report filed by the State had been perused by the Court. The same shows the prosecutrix leaving her house at 7:21 p.m. and returning at 7:27 p.m. Since a perusal of the said CCTV footage, prima facie, did not support the allegations made by the prosecutrix against the accused, the matter was adjourned for today while permitting the petitioner to examine the said CCTV footage.

During the course of hearing, it has been brought to the notice of the court that there are several other litigations pending between the parties. The premises of the petitioner/ prosecutrix is at a distance of about 5 kms. from

the residence of the accused. Mr. Katyal, on instructions, submits that the accused left the premises at 7:03 p.m. and returned at 7:17 p.m.

Thus, prima facie, it appears that the accused had returned to his premises even before the prosecutrix left her home at 7:21 p.m. Even otherwise a perusal of the CCTV footage installed at the premises of the prosecutrix, prima facie, does not support the case of the prosecution.

In these circumstances, I find absolutely no merit in this petition. The same is, accordingly, dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

MARCH 17, 2017

sr