

2

\$~48

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

BAIL APPLN. 2451/2017

MICHAEL

....Petitioner

Through:

Mr. Ashish Upadhayay,
Advocates.

versus

THE STATE

.....Respondent

Through:

Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for
State/respondent with SI
Sumit, Police Station: Crime
Branch.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

%

ORDER

04.12.2017

1. By this present application filed under Section 438 of Cr. P.C., the petitioner seeks **Anticipatory Bail** in FIR No. 88/2017 under Section 489D/419/468/472/120B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (herein referred as IPC) registered at Police Station Crime Branch.
2. The case in hand was registered on the basis of secret information received in the office of Central Range, Crime Branch vide DD No. 04 through an informer that "a person residing in Shastri Nagar prints fake currency notes of Rs. 2000/- and if a raid is conducted the same can be recovered"; that after due intimation to the seniors raid was conducted at H. No. A-619, 2nd Floor, Shastri Nagar, Delhi wherein one person namely Imran Khan@ Armaan was apprehended; that 89 counterfeit Indian currency notes of denomination Rs. 2000/- and 54 printed sheets (uncut notes) each

consisting of 4 notes of Rs. 2000/- of total value of Rs. 6.10 Lacs were recovered from his possession; that during interrogation co-accused Imran disclosed that he printed all the currency with the help of the recovered computer and printer for the petitioner Michael@ Bunty; that the petitioner further supplied the same in the market.

3. Mr. Ashish Upadhayay, counsel for the petitioner contended that the charge sheet reveals that there is no evidence against the petitioner except the disclosure statement; that there is no evidence to the effect that the accused Imran and the petitioner ever remained in contact with each other; that a separate FIR has been lodged against the investigating officer ASI Rakesh by the CBI for asking bribe from the sister of the accused Imran which reveals that there is every possibility of false implication of the petitioner in the present case.
4. Per contra, Mr. Amit Ahlawat APP for the State vehemently opposed the bail application and contended that the petitioner has failed to join the investigation till date; that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the entire trail of the crime; that the petitioner is likely in possession of other counterfeit Indian currency; that the petitioner even now came twice to collect notes. He further contended that after non-execution of Non-bailable warrants, process under section 82 Cr.P.C has been initiated against the petitioner.

4

5. I have heard the submissions made on behalf of both the sides and also gone through the contents of the petition and the record of this case.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the investigation is at preliminary stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to effect the recovery of counterfeit notes. Also, the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. Moreover the petitioner is absconding and has failed to join the investigation till date. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.
7. Before parting with the above order it is made clear that the observations made in the order shall have no impact on the merit of the case.
8. The bail application stands disposed of.


SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J.

December 04, 2017