

\$~42

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3064/2019**

AKARAM ALI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr Asim Naeem, Mr Sidharth Jalta,
Mr Asad Siddiqui, Advocates.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through Ms Kusum Dhalla, APP
Si Sushil Kumar, P.S. IGI Airport.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

11.12.2019

CRL.M.A. 42461/2019

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 3064/2019 & CRL.M.A. 42463/2019

3. The petitioner has filed the present application, *inter alia*, seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 417/2019 under Sections 419/420/468/471/120-B of the IPC and Section 12 of the Passports Act, 1967, registered with Police Station IGI Airport, Delhi.
4. The said FIR was lodged as one passenger who was travelling to United States of America was found to be disguised as an old man on a wheel chair. On further enquiry, it was found that the said passenger was a young person and was travelling on a fake passport. He had alleged that he

had paid ₹30 lakhs to an agent (one Sh Siddhu) for arranging his traveling papers in order for him to travel to the United States of America. It is alleged that the documents obtained by him were forged and fabricated.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner claims that he is a travel agent and contends that his role was limited to collecting the passport for a fee. The petitioner states that he is not aware of any forgery and is not involved in fabricating any forged papers. He has merely performed the services of collecting the passport.

6. It is seen that the allegations are of conspiracy and, therefore, it would be necessary for the investigating agencies to examine all aspects of the matter. It is also pointed out that a petition for anticipatory bail by one other person (Bharat Bhai Shankarbhai Patel) alleged to be involved in the said incident was also rejected by this Court by an order dated 24.10.2019 in Bail Application No. 2676/2019.

7. In view of the above, this Court does not consider it apposite to accede to the prayer made in this application. The application is, accordingly, dismissed.

8. The pending application is disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

DECEMBER 11, 2019

pkv