

\$~10

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 25.07.2018

+ BAIL APPLN. 1012/2018

AJAY KUMAR

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajiv Khosla, Adv.

For the Respondent: Ms. Neelam Sharma, APP for the
State.
SI Kailash Kumar, PS Mangol Puri.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT
25.07.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.355/2018 under Sections 451/506/34 IPC, PS Manogl Puri. Subsequently Sections 452 IPC and 30 Arms Act have been added. Allegations in the FIR are that the petitioner had gone into the shop of the complainant and thereafter threatened with a weapon.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner

has been falsely implicated and the CCTV footage which has been seized by the prosecution clearly shows that the petitioner had not gone there with the intention to threaten the complainant rather the CCTV footage shows that the petitioner had gone there as there was some dispute with regard to repayment of money of the petitioner which was to be repaid by the complainant and subsequently some altercation took place and further shows that the petitioner was not the aggressor.

3. By order dated 04.05.2018, the petitioner was directed to join investigation. Learned counsel submits that the licensed revolver of the petitioner along with arms license deposited with the Investigating Officer.

4. Learned APP confirms that the petitioner did join investigation as and when was required by the Investigating Officer.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case and keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail by the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer/SHO, on his furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer/SHO.

6. The petitioner shall not do anything, which may prejudice

either the investigation or the prosecution witnesses. The petitioner shall join investigation, as and when so required by the Investigating Officer.


7. Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

8. Order Dasti under the signature of the Court Master.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

JULY 25, 2018

ns



नित्यमेव जयते