

\$~6

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 461/2017

GAURAV VERMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Madhu Mukul Tripathi and Mr.
Arvind Kumar, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP with
SI/Khushbu Singh, P.S. Kalyanpuri.
Ms. Inderjeet Sindhu, Adv. for
Complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

29.01.2018

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner and prosecutrix, who is major, were in relationship. After their relationship broke off prosecutrix lodged the present FIR with the allegations that petitioner had forcibly established physical relations with her on the pretext of marriage. It is submitted that petitioner never promised prosecutrix that he would marry her. Certain photographs have been filed to show that prosecutrix and petitioner were in a relationship. It is further submitted that prosecutrix has improved her version in her subsequent statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. wherein she has levelled allegations that petitioner had forcibly established physical relations with her in the year 2010 and, thereafter, continued to sexually exploit her.

Learned APP, who is assisted by the counsel for the complainant, has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. It is contended that petitioner and prosecutrix were know to each other for the past several years. Even in the year 2010, petitioner had forced sex with the prosecutrix and continued to sexually exploit her thereafter. Petitioner had promised to marry the prosecutrix but subsequently, booked out and stated that he would not marry the prosecutrix. Allegations are serious in nature, therefore, petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Keeping in mind the totality of the facts and circumstances of this case as detailed above, it is ordered that in case of arrest petitioner be released on anticipatory bail, subject to furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer/SHO of the concerned police station.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms.

Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JANUARY 29, 2018

ga