

\$~1

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 774/2018**

NAWAL KISHOR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Kumar Arya, Mr. Sanjeev Malik, Mr. Raj Karan Sharma, Mr. Anshul Malik, Mr. Ashwyn Kalra and Mr. Aditya Kumar Yadav, Advs.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Neelam Sharma, APP for State with SI Sonu Siwach, P.S. Saria Rohilla.
Mr. Lokesh Khanna, Adv. for Complainant with complainant in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

11.12.2018

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prosecutrix is major aged about 26 years. Prosecutrix was in a relationship with petitioner. After their relationship broke off petitioner has lodged this FIR in the month of February, 2018. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that voice sample of petitioner has already been taken, inasmuch as, petitioner has joined the investigation. Therefore, benefit of anticipatory bail may be extended to petitioner.

Learned APP, who is assisted by the counsel for the complainant, has

contended that petitioner met the prosecutrix in the year 2010. On 23.02.2013 he took the prosecutrix to Hari Kripa Hotel, Sarai Rohilla, Delhi and committed forcibly sex with her. He promised the prosecutrix that he would marry her. On 11.05.2013 petitioner again took the prosecutrix in a hotel at Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan and established physical relations with prosecutrix. On 12th/13th May, 2013 petitioner took the prosecutrix to Teej Hotel, Nawalgarh, Rajasthan and established physical relations with her. Petitioner's family promised that they would marry her with petitioner after their son gets a job. Talks of marriage took place with the petitioner's family. On 06.12.2013 petitioner again took the prosecutrix to a hotel at Sarai Rohilla and established physically relations with her. On 07.11.2013 petitioner took the prosecutrix to Sun Plaza Hotel, Karol Bagh where they stayed together. On 28.01.2017 petitioner again took the prosecutrix to a hotel at Sarai Rohilla where they stayed up to 30.01.2017. Petitioner again established physical relations with her there.

Learned counsel for the prosecutrix submits that petitioner has been threatening the prosecutrix. Learned APP, on instructions of Investigating Officer, submits that no such complaint has been received from the prosecutrix.

Keeping in mind the 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 ₹25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer/SHO of the concerned police station.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms.

Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

DECEMBER 11, 2018

ga