

\$~1

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 1787/2017

LALIT ARORA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Abhijit Kumar Chattopadhyay,
Mr.Sandeep Lamba & Ms.Anil
Kumari, Advocates

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms.Kusum Dhalla, APP for the State
with ASI Saroj Bala PS Amar Colony

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

14.09.2017

CRL.M.A.14758/2017

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

Bail Appl.1787/2017

1. By way of this application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 335/2017 under Section 354-A/376/406/506 IPC, registered at PS Amar Colony, Delhi.
2. Notice. Ms.Kusum Dhalla, APP for the State accepts notice and furnishes the status report.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the allegations made against the petitioner are false which can be inferred from the fact that the petitioner and his wife were called in the police station on 20th May, 2017 and compelled to issue cheques to the complainant to settle the dispute and the compromise was finally recorded in the handwriting of the

complainant in the presence of the police official who endorsed the settlement. Had there been any incident dated 14th May, 2017 as mentioned in the FIR, she would have disclosed to the police when the parties appeared in the police station and the matter was compromised on 20th May, 2017. It is also submitted that co-accused Laxmi Rani, wife of the petitioner has already been released on anticipatory bail by the learned ASJ but the petitioner has been denied the anticipatory bail on the ground that there are specific allegations of sexual assault against him.

4. In case FIR No.335/2017 PS Amar Colony, the complainant has mentioned as to how she came into contact with the petitioner and his wife and parted with the amount of ₹7.5 lakhs to seek a job in Dubai. She has mentioned that the petitioner employed her. He also asked her to bring more Indian candidates and then he will arrange a job for her as well give commission to her. She has also mentioned that thereafter she had been sexually assaulted and also taken to a hotel. While referring to the circumstances under which the settlement has taken place on receiving the cheques issued by Laxmi Rani, wife of the petitioner and the reason why she did not mention about the sexual assault at that time, she has explained in the FIR that her brother Anuj Bhatnagar was there with her in the police station. Had she disclosed him about sexual assault by the petitioner Lalit Arora, he would have given beating to Lalit Arora. She has also explained that due to shame and inferiority complex she did not disclose about incident of sexual assault at that time.

5. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the allegations against the petitioner, I do not find it to be a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The application is dismissed.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2017/‘pg’