

10# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1984/2018**

KALICHARAN JADHAV Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr. Kunal Sharma, Advocate.**

versus

STATE Respondent

Represented by: **Ms. Meenakshi Chauhan, APP for
State with SI Shailender, PS Amar
Colony.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

29.10.2018

%

1. By this petition, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.44/2015 under Section 420/34 IPC registered at PS Amar Colony, Delhi on the complaint of one Birpal Singh.

2. Allegations of the complainant in the FIR are that he knew the petitioner who was a property dealer and running his business from his residence at C-14, Indira Enclave, Neb Sarai, New Delhi and also at Village Nangla Shahpur, PS Rabupura, District Gautam Budh Nagar, U.P. Petitioner introduced the complainant to one Kishore claiming to be an MCD employee. The said Kishore assured the complainant to get allotted MCD Shop No. 33 with roof rights situated at Central Market, Lajpat Nagar, Delhi and also produced demand-cum-allotment letters dated 30th March, 2009 and 12th June, 2009 issued from MCD in this effect. On the strength of demand-cum-allotment letters the complainant issued cheques for a sum of

BAIL APPLN. 1984/2018

Page 1 of 2

₹6,08,500/-, ₹3,58,510, ₹74,440 and ₹12 lakhs. Thereafter the said Kishore kept on meeting the complainant however, after six months, he stopped attending to his calls and disappeared. The two cheques given by the complainant were encashed in the name of Ravi Dass and it was revealed that the person named Kishore was actually Ravi Dass.

3. Considering the nature of allegations against the petitioner, that is, he only introduced the petitioner to Kishore @ Ravi Dass who was working in MCD as an MCD employee, this Court finds it to be fit case to grant anticipatory bail. It is, therefore directed that in the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety bond of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/SHO concerned, further subject to the condition that the petitioner will join the investigation as and when directed by the Investigating Officer and in case of change of residential address the same will be intimated to the court concerned by way of an affidavit.

4. Petition is disposed of.

5. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

OCTOBER 29, 2018

‘vn’