

\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 4471/2018
MS. KRITIKA MALHOTRA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Yogesh Rathee, Adv.
versus

THE STATE & ANOTHER Respondents
Through: Mr. M.S. Oberoi, APP for State

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER
% **05.09.2018**

Petitioner is aggrieved by the regular bail granted to respondent no.2 by the trial court vide order dated 06/06/2018. Trial court has noted that respondent no.2 had already spent 62 days in custody. There was delay in lodging the FIR. Prosecutrix alleged that she was in a relationship with the respondent no.2 for the last four years. Trial court has further noted that prosecutrix and respondent no.2 had visited various places. They remained in touch on phone even at odd hours. Between the period 01/03/2018 and 28/03/2018, prosecutrix had sent more than 800 SMS to respondent no.2. CDR was relied upon for this purpose. Even after registration of FIR, prosecutrix had been sending SMSs to respondent no.2. At the time of her medical examination, prosecutrix had told the doctor that she was having sexual relationship with respondent no.2 for the last four years.

In the facts and circumstances of this case, I do not find any perversity in the impugned order which can be said to have resulted in miscarriage of justice.

Petition is dismissed. Miscellaneous application is disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

SEPTEMBER 05, 2018
ga