

10# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 876/2018**

PARMOD KUMAR @ KISHAN

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr. Sumit Choudhary and
Mr. Anuj Arya, Advocates.**

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT DELHI

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Ms. Meenakshi Chauhan, APP
for State with ASI Satya Pal,
PS Pandav Nagar.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

15.05.2018

%

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.108/2018 under Sections 354/354D/506/509 IPC registered at PS Pandav Nagar, Delhi.

2. The allegations of the complainant in the above noted FIR are that on 7th March, 2018 while she was attending the marriage reception in her locality, the petitioner who was also residing in the same street, recorded her video on his mobile phone without her consent. She further alleged that whenever she goes out of her house, the petitioner used to come in the street, would stare and make indecent gestures. On 12th March, 2018, the petitioner tried to get the mobile number of the complainant from her brother-in-law who was working with the petitioner. Again on 6th April, 2018 at about 6.15 PM, when she was going to her house from nearby shop, petitioner restrained her by holding her hand and asked her mobile number by saying

BAIL APPLN. 876/2018

page 1 of 2

that he likes her very much. Somehow, the prosecutrix/complainant managed to escape from there and told the entire incident to her family. Thus a PCR call was made.

3. The main contention of petitioner is that the complaint of the petitioner was prior in time as on that day another FIR was registered on the complaint of the petitioner, who was beaten mercilessly by the complainant's family being FIR No.107/2018 and the above noted FIR which was registered on the complaint of the complainant/prosecutrix being FIR No.108/2018 was a counter blast.

4. As noted above the genesis of the occurrence is the continuous course of misbehaviour by the petitioner, first making the video of the complainant and thereafter asking for her mobile number and then stopping her on the way. Considering the nature of allegations and that the mobile phone on which the video was made is required to be recovered, this Court finds not ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Bail application is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

MAY 15, 2018
'vn'