

\$~8

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1976/2019**

SUMAN LATA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akhilesh Singh and Mr. Anil
Singh, Advocates.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Radhika Kolluru, APP for State
with SI Veer Singh, P.S. Dwarka
North.

Mr. Randhir Kr., Mr. Neeraj Dahiya
and Mr. Gurmeet Nehra, Advs. for
Complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

17.02.2020

1. By the present bail application, the applicant seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 258/2019 under Sections 448/380/451/323/427/34 IPC registered at P.S. Dwarka North.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the matter. It is submitted that the applicant has joined the investigation and that co-accused Yogesh (son of the applicant) has deposited Rs.2.5 lacs with the Registrar General of this Court. It is further submitted that the co-accused Pradhan has been admitted to bail.
3. Learned APP for the State, who is duly assisted by the counsel for the complainant, states that the applicant is the mother of the co-accused Sakshi and Yogesh. It is further submitted that as per the CCTV footage, the applicant is found present at the spot on the day of the incident. It is further

stated that the role of the present applicant is different from the co-accused as she has been specifically named in the statements of the independent public witnesses namely, Vijay Kumar and Mohd. Monu, who have stated that the present applicant had called them at the spot subsequent to which, they had shifted some of the articles i.e., one VIP suitcase, CD player, 6 cartons and two cartons of cloth to near the Metro line at the house of the present applicant. The statements of these witnesses were also recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. where they have reiterated their aforesaid version. It is further submitted that in the aforesaid incident besides cash, jewellery articles and other valuables, the 'commercial pilot licence' and the 'passport' of the complainant's daughter have been stolen and custodial interrogation is required to recover the aforesaid articles. The co-accused Pradhan was released on regular bail.

4. In view of the above facts and circumstances, I do not find it to be a fit case to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2020

ga