

\$~

*

+

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
BAIL APPLN. 2129/2017 & CRL.M.A. 17323/2017

Order reserved on 26th October, 2017
Order pronounced on 30th October, 2017

KEWAL KRISHAN Petitioner
Through: Ms. Gita Dhingra, Advocate.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI Respondent
Through: Ms. Anita Abraham, APP with SI
Arvind Kumar, P.S. Vivek Vihar.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

CRL. M. A. No. 17323/2017

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 2129/2017

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.PC read with Section 482 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 425/2017 under Section 419/420/467/471/170/120-B/34 IPC registered at Police Station – Vivek Vihar on the allegation that the accused persons extorted money from the complainant on the pretext of getting him a government job to him.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is a permanent resident of Delhi and joined the Cyber Café owned by his brother-in-law about two and half years; that has no role to play in the alleged offence as he never downloaded any format or fed it in the computer of the Cyber Café; that any customer can use the system and take the printouts on payment of certain charges; that he has not been named in the complaint/FIR; that he joined the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer served him a notice under Section 41(1) Cr.PC.
3. Status report has been filed by the State.
4. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the present application and argued that the petitioner played an important role in the entire episode of extorting money from the complainant. She further added that the petitioner has every knowledge about the entire forged game played by the accused persons and he played a vital role in the entire episode; that the petitioner in connivance of other accused persons got the print out of the forged document from the internet.
5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
6. According to the prosecution, the complainant/Asif Ali met accused Rawendra Singh for getting a job through his brother. Accused Rawendra Singh introduced himself as a CBI Officer and promised to manage a Government job. The complainant

was called at Lucknow where he gave Rs.3,50,000/- to accused Rawendra Singh and his brother Ankit Singh and certain forms were filled. Thereafter, the complainant was called at Kanpur and his signatures were obtained on a register for training. The complainant was called at Unnaw for training where he was informed that someone else would attend training on his behalf and he was given an Identity Card and informed that he has been appointed in FCI. Later on the Identity Card was taken back and informed that the same will be given at the time of joining. Thereafter, the complainant was informed that he has been declared a permanent employee by the Court and Rs.5,000/- were taken from the complainant towards Court Fee. The complainant was given an Identity Card and asked to join at Fatehabad, Haryana in first week of August. Later, the complainant came to know that he has been cheated.

7. On 27.08.2017, accused Ankit Singh was arrested and a fake CBI Identity Card and four appointment letters were of Northern Railway were recovered from his possession. At the instance of accused Ankit Singh, co-accused Ajeet Singh was arrested and a laptop used for preparation of forged documents alongwith appointment letters of SBI, signed OMR Sheets, stamps etc. were recovered from his possession. Later, co-accused Ravendra and Gyanendra arrested and many incriminating documents were seized from their possession.

8. During interrogation, accused Gyanendra disclosed that petitioner prepared the fake documents. The petitioner joined the investigation and stated that he took Rs.50 each page for printing the material provided by the accused Gyanendra. He further stated that he used to fill up the names of the victims in the blank formats of concerned department on the direction of the accused Gyanendra. Some formats in the computer of the petitioner were found to be the same as the hard copies recovered from the possessions of other accused persons.
9. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court finds it appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with two sureties of like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court and further subject to :
- i) That the petitioner shall not leave the National Capital Territory of Delhi without the prior permission of the Trial Court;
 - ii) That the petitioner shall remain present on each date of hearing before the Trial Court;
 - iii) That the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when directed by the Investigating Officer; and
 - iv) That the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any persons acquainted with the facts of the present case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

10. It is made clear that violation of any of the above terms and conditions, the State is at liberty to seek cancellation of bail of the applicant.
11. Application stands disposed of.

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

OCTOBER 30, 2017
gr

