

\$~45

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 588/2018**

MOHAN LAL

..... Petitioner

Through **Mr. Santosh Chaurihaa, Adv.**

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through **Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP with
ASI Anil Kumar, P.S. Inderpuri**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

15.03.2018

Crl. M.A. no. 4822/2018 (exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Application is disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 588/2018 & Crl. M.B. No. 457/2018

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has not been named in the statement dated 11th October, 2013 recorded by the police. FIR was not even registered. Complainant/prosecutrix filed an application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. FIR was registered thereafter on the directions of Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi. Even in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C., the role assigned to the petitioner is that after the incident was over, petitioner had come to the hospital and threatened the complainant to

withdraw the case. During the investigation, he was not arrested. Charge-sheet has already been filed.

Learned APP has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. She submits that petitioner has been named in the statement of prosecutrix. Petitioner had gone to hospital and threatened the complainant.

Keeping in mind the totality of facts and circumstances of this case, it is ordered that in case of arrest, petitioner be released on bail, subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹20,000/-(Rupees Twenty Thousand Only) with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer/SHO concerned.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms. Miscellaneous application is disposed of as infructuous. Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

MARCH 15, 2018

r.bararia