



\$~92

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2735/2024**

INDERJEET SINGH

.....Petitioner

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

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr.Aman Usman, APP for State with
Mr.Sushanth Choudhary, Ms.Sunita
Farswan, Mr.G.R. Dhir, Mr.Akshay
Choudhary, Mr.Varun Sharma,
Mr.Rahul and Mr.Arun Sanwal,
Advocates with SI Lalit Kumar, P.S.
EOW.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

% **06.08.2024**

CRL.M.A. 22868/2024

1. Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 2735/2024

3. The present application has been filed on behalf of the applicant seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0044/2023 filed under Sections 420/406/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC), registered at Police Station Economic Offences Wing (EOW), Mandir Marg.
4. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, in the garb of running a travel agency, was running a Ponzi scheme in which he cheated 65 persons to the tune of Rs.80 lakhs.



5. Counsel for the applicant submits that it is the mother of the complainant, one Ms. Jaswinder Kaur who had collected the money from the aforementioned 65 persons and not the applicant. It is further submitted that the police is not investigating the role of the mother of the complainant.
6. In rebuttal, learned APP for the State submits that as a part of the investigation, the role of the mother of the complainant is also being investigated.
7. In any case, if the applicant believes that the role of the mother is not being investigated, he would have his remedies in law.
8. Attention of the Court has been drawn to an earlier order dated 9th May, 2024 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court whereby anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the applicant has been dismissed. The Court, in the said order, noted that the allegation against the petitioner is serious, considering the large number of victims who have allegedly been duped of their savings with the assurance of doubling their money.
9. Counsel for the applicant has failed to point as to how there has been a change in the circumstances since the passing of the aforementioned order dated 9th May, 2024 that would entitle the applicant to file a fresh application for grant of anticipatory bail.
10. To be noted, even after the rejection of his anticipatory bail by this Court on 9th May, 2024, the applicant has not surrendered till date.
11. I do not find any merit in the present application. The application is accordingly, dismissed.

AMIT BANSAL, J

AUGUST 6, 2024/v