

14# \$~

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4040/2016

SMT RENUKA SINGH

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Mayank Sharma and Mr.
Safiq Khan, Advocates.

versus

STATE & ANR

..... Respondents

Represented by: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for the
State with Inspector Praveen
Ahlawat, SHO PS Rani Bagh.
Mr. Rishi Pal Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

%

16.03.2017

1. By this petition the petitioner seeks cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the respondent No.2 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge vide order dated 6th June, 2016.
2. In the present petition, the grounds inter alia taken by the petitioner seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail are that despite opportunities the respondent No.2 did not hand over his mobile phone which he was using on 3rd March, 2015, secondly he is frequently going out of station without seeking leave of the Court despite the condition imposed and thirdly he has tampered with the records of the various resorts and hotel and specifically tampered visitors' record maintained by Tiger Resort, Lansdown.

CRL.M.C. 4040/2016

Page 1 of 2

3. On a notice being issued to the State, a status report has been filed. As per the status report the statement the owner of the Tiger Resort, Lansdown was recorded on 6th September, 2016 and the cutting made below the name of respondent No.2 was done by him at the time when he had taken the room however, in the number of persons residing in the room, it is clearly stated that one male, one female and two children and there is no cutting thereon. Thus there is no tampering of the evidence after the respondent No.2 has been granted anticipatory bail.

4. In respect of the claim that the respondent No. 2 is going out of station without prior permission of the Court concerned, no specific averment or fact has been stated and a general averment has been made. Further as many as six mobile phones of respondent No.2 have been seized vide seizure memos dated 29th April, 2016, 6th May, 2016, 30th May, 2016 and 19th November, 2016.

5. It is well settled that conditions for grant of bail and cancellation of bail are different. Once anticipatory bail/bail is granted, this Court would interfere therein either on the ground that the order is perverse or that the person granted bail is violating the conditions. As noted above the petitioner has not been able to show that any of the conditions imposed while granting bail has been misused or abused.

6. Consequently the present petition is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

MARCH 16, 2017/‘vn’

CRL.M.C. 4040/2016

Page 2 of 2