

\$~16

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 30.10.2018

+ BAIL APPLN. 2206/2018

AMIT CHAUDHARY

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner :

Mr. V.C. Gautam and Mr. Vikas Tomar,
Advs.

For the Respondent :

Mr. Meenakshi Dahiya, Addl. PP for the
State

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

30.10.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No. 159/2018 under Sections 457/380/411/34 of the IPC registered at Police Station Anand Parbat, New Delhi.

2. The allegations against the petitioner are that the complainant who had a factory of manufacturing jeans. It is alleged that 30 rolls of jeans material were stolen from the factory of the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated.
4. Status report has been filed. The same is taken on record.
5. As per the prosecution, 4 to 5 persons were captured in the CCTV footage loading the stolen articles in a vehicle.
6. Learned Addl. PP submits that the footage is not clear and the persons could not be identified and the footage has been sent to FSL to see if the identify of the persons captured in the footage could be revealed.
7. As per the investigation, it is alleged that the petitioner was to receive the stolen articles. A sum of Rs. 4.5 lakhs were settled for purchasing the stolen articles. It is alleged that at the stage when negotiations were going on, the accused persons were apprehended and they were found in possession of the stolen articles.
8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even as per the investigation, the petitioner is not alleged to be one who had stolen the articles but is alleged to be one who was attempting to purchase the articles. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is nothing to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence except the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is inadmissible.
9. The petitioner has been in custody since 08.06.2018. Learned

counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a young boy and is a Computer Programmer and has clean antecedents.

10. Investigation has been completed and the chargesheet has already been filed.

11. Without commenting on the merits of the case and perusal of the record shows that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of bail.

12. Accordingly, on petitioner furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned trial court, petitioner shall be released on bail, if not required in any other case. The petitioner shall not do anything which may prejudice either the trial or the prosecution witnesses.

13. Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

14. Order *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

OCTOBER 30, 2018
‘rs’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J