

\$~12

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2329/2016**

AMARDEEP SINGH BHATTI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Manish Aggarwal, Mr. Vijay, Mr.
Runul Rastogi and Ms. Priyanka
Kathuria, Advocates

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP with SI
Rahul Kumar, PS Jagatpuri
Mr. Khalil A. Ansari, Mr. S.N.Khan,
Mr. Mohammad Akhtar and Mr. Arif
Shakeel, Advocates for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

19.07.2017

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated by the complainant in view of the property dispute between him and the complainant, in respect of the property bearing nos. S-62 and S-63, Gali No.-20, South Anarkali Subzi Mandi Chowk, Jagatpuri, New Delhi. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. His name has been introduced by the complainant in her statement under section 164 Cr.P.C., recorded after 10 days of the lodging of the FIR.

In the FIR, Monu, Vipin and one Sardar have been mentioned. Petitioner is not a Sardar. Monu and Vipin have already been released on bail. Nothing is to be recovered from him.

Learned APP for the State who is assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, has vehemently opposed the bail application. It is submitted that petitioner is also involved in another FIR lodged by the daughter of the complainant. Petitioner intends to grab the property of complainant. He hatched a conspiracy with Monu and hired him to kill the complainant.

I have perused the statement under section 164 Cr.P.C and the material placed on record.

Keeping in view the totality of the above facts and circumstances it is ordered that in the event of arrest, petitioner be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹ 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer / IO.

A.K. PATHAK, J

JULY 19, 2017

gb