



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 3848/2024**

RAHUL DOGRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. J.P. Singh, Mr. Upendra Yadav,
Mr. Shivansh Bhatiya and Mr.
Hemant Sharma, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

11.11.2024

%

1. By way of present bail application, the applicant seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 422/2024 registered under Sections 308(2)/308(4)/125/3(5) of BNS read with Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act at P.S. Kanjhawala, Delhi.
2. Mr. Singh, Id. Counsel for the applicant submits that applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case as there is no material on record which substantives the allegations made in the FIR. He further submits that though the complainant has referred to certain mobile numbers from which he statedly received extortion calls, however none of the said mobile numbers belong to the present applicant. It is also stated that there is no CDR connectivity between the present applicant and the complainant. He submits that the other three accused, who had joined the investigation, have been bound down by the IO whereas the present applicant has not received any notice to join the investigation.
3. Bail application is opposed by the Ld. APP for the State who submits that as per the complaint given by the complainant, he has alleged that the



present applicant has been regularly extorting money from the complainant. It is stated that on three earlier occasions the complainant has been asked to pay certain amount by the person who claimed himself to be member of the Jitender @ Gogi gang. It is submitted that complainant has also received calls from one *Manjeet@Monu* who has also asked the complainant to pay the money as demanded by the applicant. Further, though the applicant has claimed himself to be owning the mobile numbers however, on enquiry the Consumer Application Form was found to be in the name of one *Divyanshu Chaudhary* and on reaching the address mentioned in the form, enquiry revealed that said *Divyanshu Chaudhary* used to live there on rent about 15 years ago. Further, in pursuance to the threats, a shootout incident took place outside the office of complainant on 22.09.2024, which was also captured in the CCTV footage. It is also stated that applicant is also involved in another FIR No. 34/2019 registered under Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act.

4. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties and perused the record.

5. As per the allegations, the applicant has claimed himself to be a part of an active criminal gang and the complaint also involves allegations of gunshots fired, inasmuch as, empty cartridges have been recovered. The incident is recorded in the CCTV footage. In the totality of the facts and circumstances, I do not find it to be a fit case for admitting the applicant on anticipatory bail. Consequently, bail application is dismissed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

NOVEMBER 11, 2024/ga