

\$~1

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 03.10.2018

+ BAIL APPLN. 2258/2018

VARSHA PANDEY

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF (NCT) DELHI

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner :

Mr. Sudhir Tewatia, Advocate.

For the Respondent :

Ms. Neelam Sharma, Addl. PP for the State
with SI Umesh Yadav, PS Janakpuri.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

03.10.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.265/2018 under Sections 420/120B/34 IPC registered at Police Station Janakpuri.
2. The allegations against the petitioner in the FIR are that petitioner along with co-accused was running a fake recruitment agency, conducting interviews and receiving deposits for securing jobs in Delhi Metro as well as the airport. Apart from the

complainant, 45 more complaints, i.e., total 46 complaints, have been received that the amounts were paid to the recruitment agency and subsequently, it has transpired that entire process was fake.

3. The petitioner is alleged to have issued receipts for receiving the registration amount as well as further amount of Rs.20,000/- from the complainants.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated as the petitioner was merely an employee and whatever amount was being paid, she would issue a receipt. He submits that she was neither the owner nor in control of the business and was only operating as an employee. He further submits that the petitioner herself is a victim of circumstances and has been used by the other co-accused.

5. Learned counsel further submits that role of the petitioner was only to receive money, issue receipts and then fix interviews of the applicants with the owners.

6. Status report has been filed. The petitioner has been in custody since 23.08.2018, she is aged 24 years and there are no adverse antecedents of the petitioner apart from the subject complaints.

7. I have perused the records of the case as well as the statements of some of the complainants which have been recorded by the IO.

8. 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 regular bail.

9. Accordingly, petitioner is directed to be released on bail on her 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, if not required in any other case. The petitioner shall not do anything which would prejudice the investigation of the prosecution witnesses.

10. The bail application is disposed of in the above terms.

11. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

OCTOBER 03, 2018
‘AA’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J.