



\$~71

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6222/2024 and CRL.M.A. 23771/2024

SARITA GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Gaurav Bahl, Advocate

versus

THE STATE (NCT) OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for State with
Mr. Sahil Arora, Mr. Vishwajeet Singh, Ms. Ritu
Kapoor Arora, Mr. Vijay Pratap Singh,
Ms.Priyanka Mishra, Advocates with SI Nitish
Kumar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

12.08.2024

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner/complainant seeks cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 by the learned ASJ, North-West District, Rohini Courts vide order dated 16.03.2024 in FIR No.1087/2023 registered under Sections 468/471/34 IPC at P.S. Mangol Puri, Delhi.
2. The petitioner claims to be the mother of respondent No.2. It is stated that after being granted pre-arrest bail, respondent No.2 has flouted the bail conditions firstly by not joining the investigation and secondly, giving threats to the petitioner.
3. Insofar as non-joining of investigation is concerned, learned APP for the State, on instructions, submits that respondent No.2 has already joined



the investigation and the I.O. has no complaint regarding the violation of the said condition. On the second aspect, learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to another FIR No.0057/2024 registered on 01.05.2024 under Sections 379/406/420/427/504/506 IPC at P.S. Chetganj, Kashi. A copy of the same is also placed on record and a reading of the same would show that it pertains to the complaint of transfer of money from the petitioner's account as well as threats being extended after grant of pre-arrest bail in the present case. The FIR is preceded by a complaint dated 24.04.2024. A perusal of the said complaint would show that there is no stamp of any police station, however, reading the said complaint as well as the contents of the FIR, would show that neither any dates nor any details have been given as to when and what threats were extended. The parameters of cancellation of bail, which are well delineated in Dolat Ram & Ors. v. State of Haryana reported as **1995 (1) SCC 349**, haven't been made out in the present case.

4. In view of the above, I find no ground to entertain the present petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed alongwith the pending application.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

AUGUST 12, 2024
na