

\$~56

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1325/2018**

PUJAN KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pramod Nagar, Advocate.

versus

STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for State with
SI Nirmala from PS Shakarpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

ORDER

15.06.2018

%

1. Present petition is filed under Section 438 read with Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure on behalf of petitioner in FIR No.741/2017 registered under Section 376/506 IPC at PS Shakarpur.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contended that the petitioner and complainant earlier worked in the same company and started a business together as partners. He further contended that during the course of business transactions some cheques were issued by the complainant which were bounced and in order to riggle out of the legal implications the complainant has lodged a false complaint against the petitioner. He further contended that in the garb of the present FIR the complainant along with her husband are pressurizing the petitioner to borne all the liabilities of the firm.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contended that no recoveries are to be effected from the petitioner and he is willing to

join the investigation.

4. Learned APP for the state filed the status report in Court and submitted that it has been alleged in the FIR that the complainant accompanied the petitioner to Mussoorie on 28.01.2016 and on 30.01.2016 forcefully made physical relations with the complainant and also took objectionable photographs of the complainant in his mobile phone and threatened her of circulating these obscene photographs in case she lodged complaint against him.
5. Learned APP for the State further contended that earlier two applications filed by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail has been dismissed by the Trial Court on 01.02.2018 and 16.05.2018 and vehemently oppose the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
6. From the perusal of the record, it transpires that serious allegations have been made against the petitioner. Non-bailable warrants have already been issued and the petitioner is not cooperating with the investigation. It is also apparent from the record that recovery of mobile phone is yet to be effected.
7. Accordingly, I do not find any merit in the present application and the same is dismissed.
8. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J

JUNE 15, 2018

rd