

\$~8

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 1298/2020

KARAMVIR

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Jai Subhash Thakur, Advocate.

Versus

THE STATE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. K.K. Ghai, APP for State with SI
Surender Kumar, IO.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER

%

29.06.2020

In terms of the order dated 22.06.2020, the status report has been submitted by the State. As per the said status report, all complaints that have been made by the accused persons are after registration of the FIR and the FIR in the instant case is dated 13.05.2020. It has also been submitted through the said status report that a complaint was made by one Mr. Suresh Kumar, s/o Shri Bhagwan on 16.05.2020 stating that he purchased a plot bearing no.50, 400 sq. yds. out of Khasra No.68/10, 68/11, 69/15, Rajeev Nagar Ext., Delhi on 12.05.2020 from Mr. Jai Kanwar and that the documents were executed one day before the registration of the case in order to move false complaints to mount pressure on the police and take benefit in the case. As regards the aspect of the documentation, the State submits that they do not relate to the instant FIR and relate to the Civil Suit titled as *Suresh Kumar Vs. Pradeep @ Lambu @ Khalifa & Anr.* in CS No.765/2020 which is pending before the Court of the Additional District & Sessions Judge as indicated vide order dated 20.05.2020.

Learned counsel for the applicant has *inter alia* placed reliance on a photograph placed on the record at page 37 of the petition stating that the same is of the Investigating Officer of the case who made a video recording of the entire incident. The Investigating Officer of the case is present and submits that at page 37 is his photograph but states that he was not making any video recording and was only attending to a call.

In the circumstances, on a consideration of the status report and the FIR in question which indicates that though the applicant has joined the investigation, he has not cooperated in the same and that the disclosure of the identity of the co-accused persons is yet to be made, coupled with the allegations in the FIR itself of an alleged assault on a public servant on duty by the applicant with his co-accused persons, there is no ground for grant of anticipatory bail.

The application is declined.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

JUNE 29, 2020

vm