

7# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2424/2016**

PANKAJ VERMA

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Shaad Anwar, Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ashok K. Garg, APP for
the State with SI Sudhir, PS
Hari Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

18.04.2017

%

1. By the present petition the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 1266/2015 under Section 408 IPC registered at PS Hari Nagar, Delhi.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that besides the disclosure statement of the accused there is no evidence against the petitioner. He states that the petitioner was not named in the FIR. The petitioner has already joined the investigation and hence the interim bail granted to him be confirmed.

3. The above noted FIR was registered on the complaint of Sunil Thakur, Area Manager, Quick Deal Logistics Pvt. Ltd. According to the complaint on 8th September, 2015 the complainant got an information from the Head Office that four packets which were sent to their warehouse were found to be defective. A team was constituted to check the same and it was

BAIL APPLN. 2424/2016

Page 1 of 2

found that the packets were entrusted to two employees Dheeraj Kumar and Gyan Singh. Later it was revealed that not only those four packets, all the 19 packets entrusted to Dheeraj Kumar and Gyan Singh were defective and contained detergent cakes instead of Apple Mobile Phones. Dheeraj and Gyan were arrested and during the course of investigation they disclosed that one more person, that is, the petitioner was also involved as the packets were handed over to him who would return the packets along with ₹5,000/- per packet. It was stated that the petitioner used to place fake orders with mobile numbers on a fake address and Dheeraj and Gyan delivered the packets on that address. The petitioner would receive the packets, open it, take out the I-phone, pack detergent cake inside the same and re-seal the packet with the stamp of Snapdeal.

4. Interim protection was granted to the petitioner by this Court vide order dated 25th November, 2016. He has joined the investigation twice however, the recovery of the mobile phones is yet to be effected.

5. Considering the allegations against the petitioner, the fact that on the disclosure of the co-accused involvement of the petitioner has been revealed and recovery of articles is yet to be made from him, this Court finds no reason to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

6. Bail application is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

APRIL 18, 2017/‘vn’