

\$~1

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2219/2017**

SONU

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Vinay Jaidka, Adv.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP with SI
Ashok Kumar, P.S. Patel Nagar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

05.12.2017

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the FIR prosecutrix has not named the petitioner nor has levelled allegations of rape against him. In the FIR, she has simply stated that she was working as maid servant in the house of co-accused Kiran. She was not treated properly. She was not given salary. She was locked in the house. Subsequently, in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C., she has levelled allegations that she was raped by co-accused Manoj, who subsequently introduced her to petitioner after four months. Petitioner told the prosecutrix that he wanted to be her friend. Thereafter, petitioner came to her employer's house and raped her, in the absence of her employer. It is submitted that co-accused Manoj has already

been released on bail. Prosecutrix has already been examined. Veracity of the allegations have to be tested during the trial, which is likely to take time.

I have perused the FIR, statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. of the prosecutrix and her cross-examination. Petitioner is in the custody for more than two years.

Keeping in mind the totality of the facts and circumstances of this case, petitioner is admitted to bail, subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹20,000/- (Rupees Twenty 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.

DECEMBER 05, 2017

r.bararia