

\$~8

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1584/2020**

SHANTI SWAROOP SATIJA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Ujjwal Puri and Ms Sonam Dixit,
Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Amit Gupta, APP for State with
SI Varun EOW.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

07.07.2020

[Hearing held through video conferencing]

CRL.M.A. 8816/2020

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 1584/2020

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No.0086/2019 under Section 420/409/120B of the IPC registered with PS Connaught Place.

3. The complainant had alleged that he had paid a sum of ₹4,32,000/- to the petitioner by way of a cheque, which was duly encashed by the petitioner in the account of M/s Sampatti Trading & Developers Limited. The complainant has also stated that in the similar fashion, he was lured to further sums as well. The petitioner had issued post dated cheques but the same have been dishonoured.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that there are multiple FIRs against the petitioner including the FIR No.151/2017 wherein he has been in judicial custody for the past two years. He submits that the petitioner has been examined as a witness in the said case and present FIR also relates to the similar offence.
5. He further submits that his application for anticipatory bail was rejected by the trial court as it was incorrectly reported that this Court had suo moto taken cognizance of the alleged offence. He states that this Court has taken suo moto cognizance of an offence in another case where there were multiple FIRs against the petitioner.
6. This Court does not consider it apposite to allow the present petition. The petitioner is in custody in another matter, therefore, the contention that he would be deprived of his liberty is not merited. Further, the fact that there are multiple FIRs or complaints against the petitioner involving similar offences is also a ground not to entertain an application for anticipatory bail.
7. The fact that the complainant has been examined as a witness in another case does not preclude him for pursuing his complaint or the prosecution from prosecuting the petitioner pursuant thereto.
8. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 07, 2020
MK