

\$~58

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2043/2017**

SHADI LAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Vipin Rana, Advocate

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State
ASI Rajender Singh, PS Geeta
Colony
Mr. R P Luthra, Advocate for
complainant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

13.10.2017

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is doing business of property broker in partnership with Surender Arora, (co-accused). The petitioner had facilitated the negotiations between the co-accused Sanjay and Sonia on one hand and the complainant on the other. There is no allegation that any money was paid by the complainant to the petitioner. The petitioner had only witnessed the document namely 'agreement to sell'.

Co-accused Sanjay and Sonia have already been enlarged on bail.

Learned APP, who is assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner has conspired with co-accused Sanjay and Sonia and was well

aware that Sanjay and Sonia had no right to sell the property. It is contended that the petitioner duped the complainant in connivance with Sanjay and Sonia which is evident from the fact that he was witness to the 'agreement to sell'.

Keeping in mind the totality of facts and circumstances and role assigned to the petitioner, petitioner is admitted to bail, subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial court.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms. Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

OCTOBER 13, 2017

sm