

\$~19

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 736/2018

PUSHPANKAR DEO

..... Petitioner

Through

Mr. Jai Gopal Garg, Ms. Mukta Garg
and Mr. Vishal, Adv.

versus

STATE OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through

Mr. M.S. Oberoi, APP
Mr. Tarunesh Kumar, Adv. for
complainant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

17.07.2018

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that complainant is his father. Petitioner has been falsely implicated by the complainant, who is his father at the instance of petitioner's brother Janender. Complainant has admitted in the written statement filed in the civil suit that he had sold the property to Ms. Sunita Devi. A copy of written statement has been annexed with the application. Petitioner may be granted anticipatory bail.

Learned APP, who is assisted by the learned counsel for complainant, has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. It is submitted that complainant has specifically alleged in the FIR that Ms. Sunita Devi

was his tenant. Petitioner took him to the office of Sub-Registrar on the pretext of executing a Rent Deed in favour of Sunita Devi. However, he got a Sale Deed executed in favour of Ms. Sunita Devi; instead of Rent Deed, inasmuch as has forged and fabricated the 'NOC'. Learned APP submits that written statement has been disputed by the complainant in the civil suit.

Keeping in mind the totality of 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 ₹10,000/-(Rupees Ten 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.

Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JULY 17, 2018

r.bararia