

chit to the victim and asked her to give reply to that chit. The victim refused to accept it. She returned the chit. After two weeks from there, the applicant again called the victim outside the classroom and gave one more chit. He told the victim that, if he she kept love relations with him, he would give good marks and that he would gift her clothes and would give anything she desired. The victim read the chit where some expression of love is mentioned. The victim immediately informed another teacher who was teaching English. That teacher assured that he would take action. However, no action was taken. Therefore, the victim told this to her father. Her father met the Chairman of the school. But even then, no action was taken against the applicant, therefore this FIR was lodged.

3. Heard Mr. Iqbal Shaikhh Dawood, Ld. Counsel for the Applicant and Mr. S.H. Yadav, Ld. APP for the State/Respondent.

4. Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that, he is falsely implicated because of political rivalry. He submitted that, his entire career will be ruined if he was arrested. He further submitted that, the chits were not in the hand writing of the applicant. He submitted

that, the applicant had attended the police station. Therefore, no purpose would be served by granting custodial interrogation.

5. As against this Ld. APP produced before me the papers of investigation which includes report of the hand writing expert.

6. I have perused the hand writing expert's report. The chit which the applicant had given to the victim was sent to the hand writing expert for comparison with the applicant's natural hand writing in a register. The register was sent for comparison. The hand writing expert's report clearly shows that, the hand writing of the chit as well as in the register of the present applicant which was in his natural hand writing were of the same person. Thus, this opinion is supporting the case of the prosecutrix. At this stage, there is sufficient material against the present applicant. The applicant's involvement is clear. The applicant is almost thrice the age of the victim. His custodial interrogation is necessary considering the gravity of the offence. Hence, the application is rejected. At this stage, Ld. Counsel for the applicant seeks six weeks extension of the interim order. However, considering the gravity of the allegations, I am not inclined

to protect the applicant. The prayer is rejected. Hence, the following order.

ORDER

Application is rejected and stands disposed of accordingly.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)