

\$~1 to 4

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

% Judgment delivered on: 15.01.2019

+ BAIL APPLN. 960/2018

JITENDER

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

+ BAIL APPLN. 1204/2018

RAJA

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

+ BAIL APPLN. 1208/2018

RAMESH CHAUHAN

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

+ BAIL APPLN. 1229/2018

SONU

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners :

Mr. Ashwini Kumar, Mr. Pawan Kumar and Ms.
Garima Verma, Advs.

For the Respondent :

Ms. Kusum Dhalla, Addl. PP for the State with SI
Bharat Singh

CORAM:-
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT
15.01.2019

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioners seek anticipatory bail in FIR No. 93/2018 under Sections 354/354-B/323/506/509/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Okhla Indl. Area.
2. Allegations in the FIR are that when the prosecutrix was in her house, she heard some people making noise outside her house and when she went out she saw that her nephew who had come to their house for celebrating *Holi* was being beaten by the petitioners. When she intervened, they misbehaved with her and are alleged to have torn her clothes and paraded her naked on the street.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated as there was enmity between the parties. He further submits that there is no evidence to substantiate the commission of the offence.
4. By order dated 08.05.2018 in Bail Application No. 960/2018, order dated 23.05.2018 in Bail Application No. 1204/2018 and 1208/2018 and order dated 24.05.2018 in Bail Application No. 1229/2018, the petitioners were respectively granted interim protection subject to their joining investigation.

5. Learned Addl. PP for the State submits that the petitioners did join the investigation and the investigation is now nearly complete and there is no further necessity of the petitioners to join further investigation.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without commenting on the merits of the case and also the fact that there is no requirement of the custodial interrogation of the petitioners, I am satisfied that the petitioners have made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the arresting officer/IO/SHO shall release the petitioners on bail on their furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- each with one surety each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Investigating Officer/SHO concerned.

8. It is directed that the petitioners shall not do anything that may prejudice either the trial or the prosecution witnesses. The petitioners shall not contact the prosecutrix or her family members.

9. The petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

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

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

JANUARY 15, 2018

'rs'