

\$~1

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1834/2017**

RAJINDER KUMAR PRAJAPATI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Pawan Sharma, Advocate

versus

THE STATE

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Amit Gupta, APP for State with
Insp. Arvind Pratap PS Mandawli.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

20.09.2017

BAIL APPLN. 1834/2017

The complainant has alleged in the FIR that talks regarding her daughter's marriage with petitioner's son were on going between the petitioner and the complainant. Petitioner represented that he was owner of plot admeasuring 200 sq yards and offered to sell the same to complainant. He assured that property was free from all encumbrances. On this assurance, complainant agreed to purchase the property and paid ₹28,00,000/- to petitioner, vide four cheques dated 9th June, 2014, 19th June, 2014, 4th July, 2014 and 21st July, 2014 respectively. However, petitioner executed documents, that is, GPA and Sale Agreement of the plot wherein sale consideration was mentioned as ₹10, 00,000/- . Marriage proposal could not be materialized. In the month of December, 2015 complainant went to see the plot where he met with one Attar Singh (son of Ranjeet), who told him

that the petitioner had sold the plot to him on 15th February, 2011 for ₹20,00,000/- . Complainant also came to know that the petitioner was not the owner of the plot and the land infact belonged to the Goan Sabha.

Keeping in mind the serious nature of allegations, I am not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Bail Application is dismissed.

A.K. PATHAK, J

SEPTEMBER 20, 2017

sm