

\$~44

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

+ CRL.REV.P. 910/2017

RAVI DUTT TRIVEDI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Batra, Ms. Monika
Talwar and Mr. Lalit, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State
with ASI Shri Ram, P.S. Hari Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

06.12.2017

Vide order dated 26th March, 2011 anticipatory bail of the petitioner was disposed of by the learned ASJ, West District, Delhi. Learned counsel for the petitioner had offered to deposit ₹25 lacs by way of FDR for a period of 3 years without prejudice to the respective pleas of the parties. FDR was to be deposited with the Investigating Officer. Petitioner had offered to deposit FD of ₹15 lacs in the name of complainant within six months and another FD of ₹10 lacs in the name of complainant in next six months. Accordingly, anticipatory bail was granted to the petitioner. The aforesaid order has even been complied with by the petitioner. Thereafter, petitioner filed an application for modification of this order. It was contended that no condition of deposit of any amount could have been imposed by the trial

court while granting anticipatory bail. Reliance was placed on the judgment dated 31st September, 2013 passed by the Supreme Court in CA No. 1436/2013 titled Sumit Mehta Vs. State of NCT of Delhi. Vide order dated 5th June, 2017, learned trial court has dismissed the application for modification of the order dated 26th March, 2011.

That is how the petitioner is before this Court by way of present revision petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

During the hearing, it is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that trial court could not have imposed any condition of deposit of any amount or FDR for granting anticipatory bail. A perusal of order dated 26th March, 2011 makes it clear that the Court did not impose any condition of pre-deposit of its own. In fact, it is the petitioner who himself had offered through his counsel to deposit FDR for ₹25 lacs, inasmuch as, petitioner has already complied with the said order.

For the foregoing reasons, petition is dismissed. Miscellaneous applications are disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

DECEMBER 06, 2017

ga