



\$~3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3557/2024 & CRL.M.A. 29787/2024 STAY**

SANJAY HARIRAM JUMANI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.K. Pillai, Mr. Neelkamal
Mishra, Mr. Ashish Raghuvanshi,
Advocates.

versus

STATE OF DELHI NCT AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP with Insp.
Pushpendra, PS-Rani Bagh.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **29.04.2025**

1. This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail, filed on behalf of petitioner in case FIR No. 80/2020 under Sections 420/406/34 IPC, registered at Police Station Rani Bagh.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that petitioner is neither a director nor has any concern with M/s Krisco Media FZC [hereinafter, "**Krisco**"]. He submits that petitioner has already joined the investigation and has furnished the address of co-accused, Mr. Amit Juman and Mr. Ranchor Juman, but has been implicated only because he is uncle of co-accused persons and this is being done, so as to pressurize the co-accused persons to settle the financial disputes between the parties. It is argued that dispute is primarily civil in nature and applicant, even though having no role, has been falsely implicated.



3. The bail application has been opposed by learned APP appearing for the State, supported by learned counsel for complainant, arguing that applicant/accused is not cooperating in the investigation. Learned APP further submits that applicant had fraudulently induced the complainant to part away 1,00,000/- USD for transfer of distribution rights of the movie, which was not eventually done. It is submitted that co-accused persons have also not been apprehended, nor are they cooperating in the investigation.

4. I have considered the rival submissions. The FIR in this case has been registered under Sections 420/406/34 IPC, based on statement of one Mr. Kailash Mishra, Administrative Officer of M/s Teleone Consumers Product Private Limited, alleging that the complainant-company owns and operates the channel, namely, "Mahamovie" and it purchases movies for broadcasting/telecasting on their channel. Co-accused, Amit Jumaní met the directors and CEO of the complainant-company in Singapore and Mumbai and introduced himself as the director of Krisco, which is a Dubai based company having its sister concern in Mumbai. He along with the present petitioner and co-accused Ranchor Jumaní and Kavi Jumaní, claimed to have dubbing rights of the movie, "Shin Godzilla" and offered to provide its distribution rights to the complainant in English language and, thereafter, dubbing it in Indian languages. They offered the company to take distribution rights of the above said movie from Krisco and due to the said inducement, the company entered into the Distribution Agreement dated 07.04.2017 and in terms of the said Agreement, complainant company transferred the agreed amount of 1,00,000/- USD in the account of Krisco. However, after receipt of this amount, the petitioner and the other co-accused persons started avoiding the complainant and did not deliver the



movie, “Shin Godzilla”.

5. During investigation, the bank statement of transactions through which the complainant-company deposited the amount of 1,00,000/- USD to the account of Krisco were collected by the investigating agency.

6. Admittedly, petitioner is not the director of Krisco. The only role attributed to the petitioner as per the status report is that, he met the CEO and director of complainant-company at Mumbai during the deal and convinced the complainant that Kavi Jumaní was looking after the works of Krisco in India.

7. The attention of the Court has been drawn to annexure 6, by which petitioner has furnished the address of co-accused Ranchor Jumaní and Amir Jumaní to the investigating agency. According to Investigating Officer, petitioner has already joined the investigation thrice. He is not required for any custodial interrogation. The evidence is essentially documentary in nature, and therefore, there is no possibility of tampering with the evidence.

8. Keeping in view the entire facts and circumstances, in particular, the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation and is not required for custodial interrogation, it is directed that in the event of arrest, petitioner be released on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 30,000/- with a surety of the like amount with a condition that he shall join and cooperate in the investigation of the case, as and when directed and shall not try to tamper with the evidence.

9. The application is accordingly disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

APRIL 29, 2025/vd/r