$~5

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 1542/2024

INDERJEET SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikram Singh Kushwaha, Mr. Roopenshu Pratap Singh and Mr. Manish Sharma, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for State with Mr. Kshitiz Garg, Mr. Ashvini Kumar and Ms. Chavi Lazarus, Advocates with SI Lalit Kumar, PS: EOW.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA

O R D E R

% **09.05.2024**

CRL.M.A. 13499/2024

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 1542/2024

1. An application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr.P.C.') has been preferred on behalf of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0044/2023, under Sections 420/406/120B IPC, registered at PS: EOW, Mandir Marg.

2. Issue notice. Learned ASC for the State appears on advance notice and accepts notice.

3. In brief, as per the case of prosecution, petitioner collected cash to the tune of about Rs. 80 lacs from about 65 victims for investing in the ponzi scheme on assurance of doubling the money in a limited period of time but siphoned off the money and thereby cheated the victims.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that present case has been falsely lodged at the instance of the complainant, since his mother, who was working as a commission agent with the company, was unable to return the money taken by her. It is pointed out that petitioner was also implicated in a case under Section 376 IPC by a colleague of mother of the complainant, wherein, the petitioner has been acquitted. The allegations of siphoning off of amount are further denied and it is submitted that a complaint had also been lodged by the petitioner against the mother of the complainant.

5. Learned ASC for the State submits that during the course of investigation, statements of concerned aggrieved persons, from whom the amount was collected for investing in ponzi scheme, has been recorded. Further, the deposit receipts are stated to have been issued by the petitioner, which were collected during investigation. It is also poined out that the company run by the petitioner was not registered with any of the authorities, in accordance with law.

6. I have given considered thought to the contentions raised.

Statement of victims recorded by the Investigation Officer during the course of investigation depicts that the money had been collected from about 65 persons, on the assurance of doubling the money and the same is further supported by deposit receipts issued by petitioner. Considering the serious nature of allegations and since large number of victims have been duped of their savings, no grounds for anticipatory bail are made out at this stage.

Application is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J.

MAY 09, 2024/*R*