

\$~1

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1810/2020**

**ANAND KUMAR @ ROHIT GUJRAL**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr M.S. Bammi, Advocate with Mr  
Arvind Sharma, Advocates.

versus

**STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)**

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Ravi Nayak, APP for State with  
SI Avdesh Yadav, PS Special Cell.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**

%

**21.07.2020**

**[Hearing held through video conferencing]**

**CRL.M.A. Nos. 9615/2020 & 9616/2020**

1. Exemptions are allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The applications are disposed of.

**BAIL APPLN. 1810/2020**

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying for bail in connection with FIR No. 138/2020, under Sections 384/385/419/420/34/120B of the IPC, registered with PS Special Cell.
4. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of a woman, who is a medical doctor (hereafter 'the complainant'). She alleged that she had met the petitioner on a Dating App (Tinder) on 14.05.2020. He had represented himself to be an orthopaedic surgeon and working as a visiting doctor in two well-known hospitals.

5. It transpires that the petitioner had put up a photograph of some random good-looking person instead of his photograph. She alleges that she became friendly with the petitioner online and without meeting him in person. They connected with each other on phone and whatsapp and also exchanged some private videos. Thereafter, he asked her to marry her as well. During the course of their conversation, he claimed that his mother was unwell and he needed some help financially (₹50,000/-). At his request, the complainant sent him a sum of ₹30,000/- through Paytm on 18.05.2020. A few days later, he had asked for the balance amount of ₹20,000/- from the complainant, however, she expressed her inability to help him.

6. The complainant also alleges that the petitioner persuaded her to meet one of his friends (one Anand). It is alleged that the petitioner claimed that he had sex with his friend's (Anand's) sister and had been caught by his friend. He alleged that Anand was now threatening him and insisting that he should also have sex with his girlfriend.

7. It appears from the complaint that the complainant agreed and she also booked one OYO Room in Chitranjan Park. She met Anand as planned but they were not allowed entry by the hotel. Anand tried to book another room in GK-II but that hotel also did not allow them any entry.

8. It now transpires that this was an elaborate charade and the petitioner had posed as Anand. Since he had placed a fake photograph on the Dating App, the complainant was not aware that the petitioner was posing as Anand.

9. There are also several other allegations in the complaint. However,

the principal allegation is that the petitioner, through this elaborate subterfuge, had persuaded the petitioner to part with ₹30,000/-. It is alleged that the investigations conducted subsequently have indicated that the petitioner had also successfully cheated other women as well.

10. The investigation is not concluded and the charge-sheet is yet to be filed. In view of the above, this Court does not consider it apposite to allow the present petition.

11. This Court had, on 10.07.2020, allowed the bail petition of the co-accused (Priyam Yadav v. State: BAIL APPLN. 1517/2020) on the ground that the only allegation against the co-accused was that the money paid by the complainant had been credited into his account. However, it was accepted that the co-accused has not met the complainant or made any representations to her. The petitioner's case cannot be equated to that of the co-accused.

12. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

**VIBHU BAKHRU, J**

**JULY 21, 2020**  
**RK**