

\$~3

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

Judgment delivered on: 26.07.2019

+ BAIL APPLN. 838/2019

RAGHAV SINGH @ RISHABH ..... Petitioner

versus

STATE ( GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI) ..Respondent

**Advocates who appeared in this case:**

For the Petitioner : Mr. C.S.S. Tomar, Advocate.

For the Respondent: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for the State.  
SI Ravinder Kumar, Spl. Staff.

**CORAM:-**

**HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA**

**JUDGMENT**

**SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)**

**BAIL APPLN. 838/2019 & CrI.M.A.6887/2019 (for interim relief)**

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.61/2018 under Section 394/397/379/411/120-B of Indian Penal Code, P.S.Jama Masjid (investigation now stands transferred to Special Staff, Central District, Kamla Market).

2. The subject FIR has been registered on the complaint of an employee of Sanjay Sales Agency.

3. As per the complainant, he was instructed by the owner to

transport goods and money in a van from their shop at Fateh Puri, Delhi to the factory at Patparganj, Delhi. It is alleged that the complainant had put four boxes in the back of the van containing goods and Rs. 15 lakhs in cash. As per the complainant after putting the goods in the back of the van he bolted the lock with a nail and sat in the front seat of the van with driver. En-route to the factory, it is alleged that their vehicle hit another vehicle bearing No. DL 1LCR 4612. It is alleged that three boys were travelling in the said van and they started fighting with the driver of the complainant. After the fight was over, they left the spot. Subsequently, someone pointed out that back door of the van was open. When they checked, it transpired that goods and cash were missing from the van.

4. The case of the prosecution is that Investigating Officer checked the CCTV footage of the locality and found some boys doing recce of the area. Based on the same, they were apprehended.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is sought to be arrested solely on the basis of a disclosure statement of co-accused Rohit Singh. He submits that in the disclosure statement though petitioner is related to Rohit Singh his name has not been mentioned. He further submits that Rohit Singh has already been admitted to regular bail by order of this Court dated 12.02.2019 titled *Rohit Singh @ Rinku vs. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi)*.

6. By order dated 01.04.2019, the petitioner was granted interim protection subject to his joining investigation.

7. Learned Addl. PP for the State, under instructions from the Investigating Officer, submits petitioner had joined investigation and the investigation qua the role of the petitioner is complete. She further submits that there is no further requirement of the petitioner to join further investigation.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view of the totality of the facts and circumstances, I am satisfied that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

9. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the arresting officer/IO/SHO shall release the petitioner on bail, on petitioner furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Investigating Officer/SHO concerned. Petitioner shall not do anything that may prejudice either the trial or the prosecution witnesses.

10. Petition is allowed in the above terms.

11. Order *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

**SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J**

**JULY 26, 2019**  
**st**