

\$~52

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 10.05.2018

+ BAIL APPLN. 1077/2018

JYOTI SINGH

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amrendra Kumar, Advocate.

For the Respondent : Ms. Neelam Sharma, APP for the State.
Ms. Namrata Sharma, Advocate for
complainant No.7 – Ms. Arun Chaddha.
SI Dharmendra Pratap Singh, PS Samaipur
Badli, Delhi.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

10.05.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

Crl.M.A.8825/2018 (exemption)

Exemption is allowed subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 1077/2018 & Crl.M.A.8826/2018 (stay)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.524/17 under Sections 420/406/34 IPC, Police Station Samaipur Badli. The allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner along with her

husband has induced several persons in the locality to part with money. It is submitted that the petitioner along with her husband had built up a reputation in the society and, as a result, members of the society trusted them and parted with several lakhs of rupees. Suddenly, one day, they absconded from their residence and were not traceable.

2. Learned APP for the State points out that apart from the complaint on which the subject FIR has been registered, there are several complaints received from other members of the locality and they have come to know that, as of now, over Rs.40,00,000/- has been borrowed in the above fashion and the investigation is on to trace out further people who may have been cheated in similar fashion. It is submitted that the petitioner and her husband had not only borrowed from several individuals but also borrowed in the name of running a chit fund and inducing several people to part with their hard-earned money. One of the individuals had invested money for the purposes of marriage of the daughter.

3. Learned APP for the State submits that the investigation is at a nascent stage and, keeping in view the facts of the case, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

4. I have perused the records of the case, which reveal that there are several complaints against the petitioner of borrowing money from not only the complainant in the FIR but several other people also. The

petitioner thereafter absconded from their residence. Investigation is at a nascent stage. In the facts of the case the demand for custodial interrogation of the petitioner, does not appear to be unjustified.

5. Keeping in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the petitioner is not entitled to grant of anticipatory bail.

6. In view of the above, the petition is dismissed.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 10, 2018
st

