

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

Judgment reserved on: 19.02.2020
% **Judgment pronounced on: 27.02.2020**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3046/2019**

KULDEEP

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. J.P.Singh, Mr. Deepak
Singh and Mr. Manish Singh,
Advocates.

versus

STATE N.C.T OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for the
State with SI Rinku Bhakar, PS
Bawana.

Complainant in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNISH BHATNAGAR

JUDGMENT

1. This is a petition filed by the petitioner under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail in case FIR No. 320/2018 under Sections 308/506/34 IPC registered at Police Station Bawana.

2. The brief facts of the case are that an information was received regarding a quarrel with a lady at House No. 2A, Krishna Vihar Colony, Bawana, on 19.07.2018. After inquiry it was revealed that quarrel had taken place between two parties for

a disputed property measuring 1 Bigha and 1 Biswa of Khasra No. 182/9 situated at Krishna Vihar Colony, Bawana, Delhi. The complainant was shifted to M.V. Hospital, Pooth Khurd, Delhi and his MLC was conducted and doctor opined in the MLC “alleged history of physical assault”. On 24.07.2018, complainant handed over a written complaint to the investigating officer alleging therein that his brother, namely, Nitin Agarwal had purchased the property in question vide registered sale deed in the year 1992 and he used to visit the property on routine basis. On 19.06.2018, he found some people carrying out excavation work using JCB on their land. The complainant was told by them that the plot belonged to one Mohan Singh and they were doing work on his instructions. The complainant intimated about the same to his uncle and on the next day he along with his family members visited the property. He found few people present on the plot and two of them introduced themselves as Mohan Singh and Surender Pehalwan and they asserted their ownership and on seeing papers they told the complainant that they were mistaken and would verify the details at their end. Complainant asked Mohan Singh and Surender Pehalwan to show their papers and a meeting was fixed. According to the complainant on 21.06.2018, complainant again visited the plot. He found that 7-8 persons were sorting/soaking the bricks. On inquiry from the local people, it transpired that construction was planned by Mohan

Singh and Surender Pehalwan, so he reported the matter to the local police. On 19.07.2018, he along with his driver visited the property to gauge any future construction and tried to inquire about the same from 2-3 laborers from nearby locality. Around 2-2:30 P.M., according to the complainant, accused Krishan along with 3-4 accomplices came in an SUV type car and started beating the people present at site with pipes and iron rods. According to the complainant, those persons also attacked him and gave him severe blows with plastic pipe on his back, so the complainant ran away from there. It is alleged that thereafter Mohan Singh, Surender Pehalwan, Krishan along with 5-6 more persons reached the plot and they were having iron rods, knives, guns in their hands. It is alleged that Mohan Singh was carrying a pistol while Surinder Pehalwan was carrying an iron rod and a gun was tied to his trousers. It is alleged that Krishan and his accomplices started hitting the complainant with pipes and rods. He was also given fists blows and kick blows. It is alleged that Mohan Singh and Surinder dragged him out of the plot and put a *tamancha* on his stomach and threatened to kill him. It is further alleged that someone snatched his gold chain from his neck and Mohan Singh took out Rs.1,50,000/- from his pocket and his mobile phone was also snatched.

3. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in the case. It is further

submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the allegations against the co-accused Mohan Singh are more serious in nature than what have been made against the petitioner, rather the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and no role has been assigned to him. It is further submitted that petitioner is in judicial custody since 31.08.2019 and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him in JC when other accused persons have been released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned APP for the State, assisted by the complainant who is present in person, has vehemently opposed the bail application and has argued on the lines of the status report. It is argued that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. It is submitted that petitioner has avoided arrest for about 14 months and in case he is released on bail his whereabouts would not be known. It is further submitted that the complainant was badly beaten and had received grievous injuries on his person. It is further argued that the petitioner along with other co-accused persons had prepared forged and fabricated documents to take possession of the plot of the complainant as accused persons are professional land grabbers.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record.

6. In the instant case three co-accused persons have already been released on bail. Accused is in judicial custody since 31.08.2019. No role has been assigned to the petitioner in the FIR. As far as question of preparation of forged documents are concerned there are no such allegations against the petitioner in this FIR. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in judicial custody. Accordingly, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with one surety in the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the learned trial court.

7. The bail application stands disposed of accordingly.

8. Nothing stated hereinabove shall tantamount to the expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

RAJNISH BHATNAGAR, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2020

AK