

\$~9

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1586/2020**

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. 8825/2020

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 1586/2020

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No.0085/2019 under Section 420/409/120B of the IPC registered with PS Connaught Place.

3. The complainant inter alia alleged that she had paid an aggregate sum of ₹12,60,000/- to the petitioner including by cheques which were duly encashed by the petitioner in the account of M/s Sampatti Trading & Developers Limited. The payments were made against investment in property in Hill View City, Jaipur with assured returns. However the petitioner nether transferred any property nor returned the funds. It is alleged

that subsequently he agreed to transfer two plots in Sanik Vihar Township against the investment of ₹12,60,000/- and share of returns of ₹4,06,650 (total ₹16,66,650/-) but failed to execute the sale deed after entering into the agreement.

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.

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 offences 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 petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 07, 2020
MK