

\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2514/2018**

VIDHUR THAKKER

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Anupam S. Sharma and Mr.
Parikshith Sharma, Advocates.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ashok Kumar Garg, APP with SI
Pratima, PS Vasant Kunj.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

29.01.2019

%

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 426/2018 under Sections 328/376 IPC registered at PS Vasant Kunj.

2. In the above noted FIR the allegations of the prosecutrix are that she was working in an event organisation and got to know the petitioner two years prior to the alleged incident dated 11th April, 2018 when the petitioner called her to a hotel and she went there to discuss the matter with him. The cold drink given to the prosecutrix was accepted by her in good faith, however, thereafter she felt unconscious and when she regained consciousness, she found herself undressed and there were other signs on the bed which indicated that she had been sexually assaulted. When the complainant confronted the petitioner that she would file a complaint against him, the petitioner promised to marry the complainant and convinced her that he was in love with her and wanted to marry her. However, later the petitioner went to Mumbai without informing her and thereafter refused to accept the calls of the prosecutrix nor replied to her messages. It is alleged

BAIL APPLN. 2514/2018

page 1 of 2

that the petitioner thereafter blocked her phone number and thus she wanted action against him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record certain materials to show that not only on 11th April, 2018 but even prior thereto both the petitioner and the prosecutrix were in relationship and had stayed at various places together which were duly booked. Thus, the version of the prosecutrix that the relationship took place between them on 11th April, 2018 for the first time is incorrect and falsified.

4. This Court has gone through the various documents placed on record suggesting that the relationship between the petitioner and the prosecutrix even prior to 11th April, 2018 was not merely a professional relationship but beyond the same and the parties had lived together at various places. Considering the material placed on record and that a charge sheet has already been filed after the investigation, this Court deems it fit to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. It is, therefore, directed that in the event of arrest the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety bond of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/SHO concerned, further subject to the condition that the petitioner will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court concerned and in case of change of residential address the same will be intimated to the Court concerned by way of an affidavit.

6. Petition is disposed of.

7. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

**JANUARY 29, 2019 /‘yo’
BAIL APPLN. 2514/2018**

page 2 of 2