

12# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1875/2015**

REKHA

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Sudhir Batra and Mr. Rohit Khanna, Advocates with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Amit Gupta, APP for the State with SI Inderveer Singh, PS Karawal Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

28.02.2018

%

1. By this petition the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 250/2015 under Sections 420/120B/34 IPC registered at PS Karawal Nagar, New Delhi on the complaint of one Dr. M.V. Biju.

2. The allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner along with her son Manish Sharma used to go for the treatment at the Clinic. The petitioner and her son lured the doctor that they were attached with the placement agency and could get admission done in any school or college. They also assured that the admission can even be done for MBBS course either in Meerut or Ghaziabad. A sum of ₹6 lakhs was paid to the petitioner and her son on 19th August, 2014 whereafter the petitioner left the rented accommodation and was not seen thereafter.

3. When the matter came up before this Court, the petitioner stated that she was willing to pay back the amount and a sum of ₹1 lakh was paid on 2nd November, 2015 and another sum of ₹1 lakhs by 3rd November, 2015.
4. Out of ₹6 lakhs till date ₹4 lakhs have been paid. Vide order dated 18th December, 2017 learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions from the petitioner submitted that the balance amount of ₹2 lakhs would be paid by the petitioner within two months, that is, ₹1 lakh on or before 25th January, 2018 and another ₹1 lakh on or before 25th February, 2018. The sum of ₹2 lakhs has not been paid till date. It is thus apparent that after having given various assurance of making payment since 9th September, 2015, the petitioner has only made part payment and defaulted repeatedly.
5. Considering the nature of allegations and the fact that the petitioner is not abiding by the terms of the settlement, this Court finds no ground to further extend the protection granted to her.
6. Petition is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

FEBRUARY 28, 2018
‘vn’