

\$~13

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 2221/2018, CrI.M.(Bail) 1510/2018,

CrI.M.A.32707/20018

TANVIR ALI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. J.A. Chaudhary, Advocate

versus

THE STATE, GOVT. OF N.C.T. OF DELHI Respondent

Through: Mr. Ashish Dutta, APP for the State
with Insp. Usha Sharma, PS Hari
Nagar.

Ms. Harsh Chachra, Adv. for
complainant with complainant in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA

ORDER

%

24.09.2018

Allegations of series of acts of commission or omission constituting offences punishable under Sections 376/506 IPC have been levelled against the petitioner in case FIR No.333/2018, registered on 27.07.2018. From the FIR itself it is clear that the relationship between the parties, was more or less consensual, though the petitioner being the employer and, thus, having a superior position *vis-a-vis* the complainant, possibly having abused his position under the pretext of promise of marriage. The material on record, however, also shows that the petitioner had allegedly prepared some images or videography recording the physical relationship to which the complainant was subjected to, he having threatened to make it viral on social media.

The petitioner was granted interim protection against arrest by the court of Sessions for certain period but it appears that during the said period threats were extended to the complainant through certain others, she having lodged a report with the police, the latter having failed to take any action on that score. The Additional Sessions Judge, while withdrawing the said interim protection, and declining release of the petitioner on bail, by order dated 01.09.2018, has also noted that the petitioner had failed to handover his mobile phone instrument for purposes of investigation.

During the hearing, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State showed to the court printouts of certain messages sent by the petitioner to the complainant on 06.07.2018 wherein he appears to have been not only abusive but also extending threats. The petitioner has failed to co-operate with the investigation and has made himself unavailable, this having resulted in process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. being initiated against him.

In these circumstances, no case for release on anticipatory bail is made out.

The petition and the applications filed therewith are dismissed.

R.K.GAUBA, J.

SEPTEMBER 24, 2018

vk