

\$~4

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 749/2019 and CrI.M.A.6246/2019

RAHUL @ GOLU

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddhartha Nanwal, Advocate

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State with SI Pankaj Kumar, PS
Mangolpuri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA

ORDER

%

25.03.2019

Status report filed.

Heard.

Perused.

A role is attributed to the petitioner in offences punishable under Sections 363/364-A/120-B/411/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) on the basis of evidence gathered during investigation of case FIR No.836/2017 of Police Station Mangolpuri. The petitioner was arrested on 03.10.2017, he having been in custody ever since. The case is presently under trial before the court of sessions where prosecution is in the midst of adducing evidence, charges having been framed for offence under Sections 120-B/363/364-A IPC. The petitioner pleads to be innocent and claims to have been falsely implicated. The case concerns kidnapping for ransom of a girl child aged 3½ years on or about 11.06.2017, this being followed by a ransom call

demanding Rs.20 lacs, which was eventually paid and the girl retrieved from the custody and control of the kidnappers. The investigating agency reached the petitioner on the basis of some secret information, his interrogation statedly having brought to light the involvement of three others, namely, Sunil Jatav, Amit Jatav and Shivam Nagar, they by that time having come to be arrested in some other case(s) and being lodged in judicial custody, the said persons having previous criminal record including in serious offences like punishable under sections 307 and 364-A IPC. The said three others are stated to have been put to test identification in which they were correctly identified. It is the case of the prosecution that at the instance of the petitioner Rs.4 lacs in cash in the form of two bundles of currency notes of Rs.2,000/- each denomination were recovered, the same being part of the money which had been paid as ransom, this being confirmed by the markings that had been made by the complainant on the said bundle of notes.

In the above facts and circumstances, it cannot be said that the case against the petition is wholly unfounded. There is no good ground to release him on bail at this stage of process.

Dismissed.

This disposes of interim application as well.

R.K.GAUBA, J.

MARCH 25, 2019

vk

BAIL APPLN. 749/2019

Page 2 of 2