

\$~31

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2303/2018**

RAJ KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Gurbaksh Singh, Adv

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State
SI Neetu Yadav, PS Aamr Colony

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

04.10.2018

Learned counsel for petitioner submits that prosecutrix is a married woman with two children and petitioner is also a married man with two daughters who are of marriageable age. Prosecutrix was a tenant of petitioner. Prosecutrix vacated the tenanted premises in the month of June, 2018. She lodged the present FIR after three months with the allegations that while she was staying in the tenanted premises, petitioner used to harass her and one day petitioner entered her room and put her on bed. The petitioner also used to tell the prosecutrix that he would change (convert) his religion and would keep her with him. It is further submitted that no allegations of rape have been levelled in the FIR. In her statement under section 164 Cr.P.C. recorded after about 4 days of registration of FIR, prosecutrix has alleged that petitioner had forcible sex with her.

Learned APP has opposed grant of bail to the petitioner. It is contended that petitioner used to harass the prosecutrix and threaten her while she was living in the tenanted premises and prosecutrix did not lodge FIR for this reason.

Keeping in mind the totality of facts and circumstances of this case, it is ordered that in case of arrest, petitioner be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer/SHO concerned.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms. Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J

OCTOBER 04, 2018

sm