

\$~16

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 981/2018**

TAJ

..... Petitioner

Through

Mr. Ravi P. Shukla and Ms. Upasna
Shukla, Advs.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through

Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP with SI
Rama Kant, P.S. Sarai Rohilla

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

16.05.2018

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prosecutrix is a married woman of 28 years of age. She was in a relationship with the petitioner. After their relationship broke off, prosecutrix has impleaded the petitioner in this false case. There is delay in lodging the FIR. Prosecutrix has alleged that petitioner had taken her in a car on 11th March, 2018 and kept her with him for about five days. She stated that she was kept by the petitioner at different places. However, she has failed to disclose the names of such places. Prosecutrix did not raise any alarm during the said period. FIR has been lodged after a month as an afterthought. Prosecutrix was a consenting party.

Learned APP has opposed the grant of bail to petitioner. She contends that petitioner had offered cold drink to prosecutrix and thereafter took her with him in a car. He kept her with him all this while and raped her. He did not allow the prosecutrix to run away.

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 ₹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.

MAY 16, 2018
r.bararia