

\$~10,11&12

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 2977/2018

BALWANT SINGH

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Sanjeev Manchanda, Mr. Harish Chawla, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ashok Kr. Garg, APP with ASI Ved Prakash PS patel Nagar.

+ BAIL APPLN. 2981/2018

RAKESH SINGH

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Sanjeev Manchanda, Mr. Harish Chawla, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ashok Kr. Garg, APP with ASI Ved Prakash PS patel Nagar.

+ BAIL APPLN. 2985/2018

RAJESH KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Sanjeev Manchanda, Mr. Harish Chawla, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ashok Kr. Garg, APP with ASI Ved Prakash PS patel Nagar.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA**

**ORDER**

**27.02.2019**

%

By these three petitions petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 160/2018 under Sections 323/452/354/427/506/34 IPC and Section 12  
**BAIL APPLN. Nos. 2977/2018, 2981/2018 & 2985/2018** *page 1 of 3*

of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act (in short POCSO Act).

The allegations in the FIR in question were that on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2018 PCR calls regarding quarrel were received at PS Patel Nagar. On reaching the spot wall of a house was found broken and some people were quarrelling with each other. Medical examination of the injured was got done. The complainant in the above-noted FIR submitted her written complaint on 3<sup>rd</sup> June, 2018 wherein she alleged that the petitioners along with some other men and ladies came in front of their house, broke the back side wall and entered the house forcefully. They also manhandled her two daughters and beat them severely. It is alleged that they misbehaved with their daughter and threatened to finish them.

Proceedings under Section 82/83 Cr.P.C. have already been initiated against the petitioners.

Petitioner Balwant Singh has placed on record a reply filed by the investigating officer wherein the statement of the factory owner where he is working has been recorded who stated that on the day of the alleged incident from 9 AM to 6 PM Balwant was working with him and he had reproduced the attendance register in this regard.

Considering the allegations as noted above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners Rakesh Singh and Rajesh Kumar. Consequently, BAIL APPLN. 2981/2018 and BAIL APPLN. 2985/2018 are dismissed.

In view of the verification conducted by the investigating officer which shows that prima facie Balwant Singh was not present at the spot, this ***BAIL APPLN. Nos. 2977/2018, 2981/2018 & 2985/2018*** ***page 2 of 3***

Court allows BAIL APPLN. 2977/2018. It is therefore directed that in the event of arrest Balwant Singh be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ SHO concerned, further subject to the condition that he will join the investigation as and when directed and will not leave the country without the prior permission of the Court concerned and in case of change of address the same will be intimated to the Court concerned.

Petition is disposed of. Order dasti.

**MUKTA GUPTA, J.**

**FEBRUARY 27, 2019**  
**‘ga’**