



\$~1 & 2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 600/2024**
VINEETAPetitioner

Through: None.

versus

THE STATERespondent
Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP.
SI Krishan Kumar, P.S. Bawana.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 602/2024**
SUNAINAPetitioner

Through: None.

versus

THE STATERespondent
Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP.
SI Krishan Kumar, P.S. Bawana.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

% **ORDER**
10.03.2025

1. On 11th December, 2024, the interim order granted by this Court on 19th February, 2024 was withdrawn by passing a detailed order to the following effect:

“1. The present petitions have been filed for grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR 497/2016. Dated 21.11.2016 registered u/s 384/506 IPC at PS: Bawana.



2. *This Court vide order dated 19.02.2024 passed an order that no coercive actions be taken against the Applicants, subject to their continuing to join the investigation.*

3. *Vide order dated 09.04.2024, the Court noted that anticipatory bail application moved before the Trial Court shows that one of the grounds taken by the applicants was that a quashing petition was filed in this Court being CRL.M.C. 4987/2018 titled 'Sunaina v. State and Anr.' wherein the complainant was stated to have filed an affidavit in support of the petition giving no objection to the quashing of the FIR. Before the Trial Court, complainant however disputed her signatures on the affidavit and stated that she had never compromised the matter or signed on the affidavit. However, the petitioner insisted that the complainant had settled the matter.*

4. *This Court taking into account this controversy sent the original affidavit in CRL.M.C. 4987/2018 to the FSL and directed that a report be filed in a sealed cover to the Registrar General of this Court. In the meanwhile, CRL.M.C. 4987/2018 was dismissed and withdrawn on 01.04.2024.*

6. *Perusal of the FSL report dated 30.04.2024 states "the aforesaid divergences are fundamental in nature and beyond the range of natural vibrations and intended disguise and when considered collectively indicate that the person who wrote the red enclosed signatures stamped and marked S1 to S5 & A1 to A10 did not write the red enclosed signatures similarly stamped and marked Q1 to Q2.*

7. *Learned APP for the State submits that in view of the FSL report, the interim protection granted to the petitioner against the contemplate may not be continued.*

8. *On behalf of the petitioner, an adjournment has been sought as main counsel is not available today.*

9. *In view of the FSL report, the Court considers that the interim protection granted to the petitioner cannot be continued, hence the interim protection granted vide order dated 09.02.2024 stands withdrawn.*

10. *In view of the fact that an accommodation has been asked for by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that main counsel is not available, list on 10.03.2025."*

2. On the said date, counsel for the Applicants had sought an accommodation as the arguing counsel was not available. Accordingly, the matters were listed for today.

3. Since morning, despite multiple calls, there has been no appearance on behalf of the Applicants.



4. Accordingly, the present petitions are dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 10, 2025

as