

Bail Application No. 1983/21
FIR No. 04/21
P.S. Gulabi Bagh
U/s 392 IPC
State Vs. Vinod Kumar @ Rohit Kalu

05.08.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application moved for accused Vinod Kumar @ Rohit Kalu under Section 437 Cr.P.C., for grant of bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Alamine, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant submits that he wants to withdraw the present application with liberty to move fresh application. Accordingly, present application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to move fresh application.

Copy of order be uploaded on the website.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

Bail application no. 2020/21
FIR No. 0125/21
P.S. Crime Branch
U/s 392/397/342/411/120B/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act
State Vs. Sunder

05.08.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application moved for accused Sunder under Section 439 Cr.P.C., for grant of bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Tanseer Ahlmed, Ld. Counsel for
accused/applicant through VC.

Reply of IO received.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused seeks adjournment for arguments on the application. At request, re-list for arguments on 09.08.2021.

Copy of order be uploaded on the website.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

Bail application No. 2057/21
FIR No. 198/2021
P.S. Wazirabad
U/s 506/420/34 IPC
State Vs. Harbinder

05.08.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application moved for accused Harbinder under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Vijay Dutt, Ld. Counsel for
accused/applicant through VC.

Reply of the application be called from IO/SHO for NDOH.

List for arguments on 07.08.2021.

Copy of order be uploaded on the website.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

Bail application No. 2058/21
FIR No. 566/18
P.S. Burari
U/s 420/120-B/34 IPC
State Vs. Dheeraj Tyagi

05.08.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application moved for accused Dheeraj Tyagi under Section 439 Cr.P.C., for grant of bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Hansraj Singh, Ld. Counsel for
accused/applicant through VC.

Reply of the application be called from IO/SHO for NDOH. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused submits that charge-sheet in the present matter has already been filed. Let TCR be also requisitioned for NDOH.

List for arguments on 10.08.2021.

Copy of order be uploaded on the website.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

Bail application No.2055/21
FIR No. 121/21
P.S. Civil Line
U/s 307/34 IPC 27/54/54 Arms Act
State Vs. Dushat @ Kaku

05.08.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application moved for accused Dushat @ Kaku under Section 439 Cr.P.C., for grant of bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Harvinder Singh, Ld. Counsel for
accused/applicant through VC.

Reply of the application be called from IO/SHO for NDOH.

List for arguments on 09.08.2021.

Copy of order be uploaded on the website.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

Bail Application No. 2056/21
FIR No. Unknown
P.S. Wazirabad
U/s Unknown
State Vs. Ram Singh

05.08.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application moved for accused Ram Singh under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Manish , Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant through VC.

Let reply of the application be called from IO/SHO for NDOH.

List on 10.08.2021.

Copy of order be uploaded on the website.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

Bail Application No. 1920/21
FIR No.136/21
P.S. Roop Nagar
U/s 392/394/34 IPC
State Vs. Sonu @ Suraj

05.08.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application moved for accused Sonu @ Suraj under Section 439 Cr.P.C., for grant of bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Zia Afroz, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant through VC.
IO through VC.

1. In compliance of order dated 03.08.2021, report qua previous involvement of the accused has been received, bearing signature of Addl. DCP, North District, Delhi.
2. Copy of the same was furnished to Counsel for accused, who reiterated vehemently that the contents of the report are incorrect. It was submitted by him that accused is on bail in all cases barring this one.
3. Now this averment of Ld. Counsel for accused is contrary to the report filed by the Addl. DCP, in as much as under the column "Status of Accused", the accused has been 'Released on Bail' only under one case at Serial No. 33 viz FIR No. 214/2013, under Section 354A/34 IPC, PS Shahdra.

Contd....2

Bail Application No. 1920/21
FIR No.136/21
P.S. Roop Nagar
U/s 392/394/34 IPC
State Vs. Sonu @ Suraj

-2-

4. There is a clear divergence in the stance adopted by the police authorities on one hand, and the one put forth by Counsel for the accused on the other hand.
5. In order to ascertain complete facts, issue notice to concerned Superintendent, Tihar Jail to file the nominal roll, period of custody and other relevant details (viz. List of cases and dates on which he was released on bail) of the accused. Compliance report be called for NDOH.
6. The Additional DCP, under whose signatures the present involvement report of the accused has been filed shall remain present on NDOH alongwith the IO.
7. Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent, Tihar and to the Additional DCP, North District, Delhi.
8. Put up on 07.08.2021.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2018/21

FIR NO. 491/21

U/s 354/354B/341/323/34 IPC

P.S. Wazirabad

State Vs Manoj Kumar

05.08.2021

Vide Order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Wazirabad and Crime Branch of Central Police District through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been filed on behalf of accused Manoj Kumar for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.

Sh. Pradeep Maurya, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

IO/SI Ved Praksh is present through VC.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed

hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicant /accused submitted that applicant herein is the office bearer/member of Gauri Shankar Ram Janki Mandir Evam Parshhuram Mandir Samiti (Regd.). It was further submitted that Raj Kumar and Ram Bahadur as well as their associates of the miscreants named above are adopting all coercive and clever tactics and also forged and fabricated documents of the Mandir and are trying to grab the property of the Mandir. Lastly, it was submitted that applicant is aged about 58 years and is a respectable person and is living in the vicinity since last bout 25 years with clean and unblemished record and he has never been indulged in any wrong or illegal activity and it is the opposite party persons who in collusion with their associate ladies are out to harass, torture and black-mail him and other office bearers and to compel them not to see the management and control of the said Mandir Samiti. Therefore, he ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State alongwith the IO vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application. It has been submitted that MLC of complainant Sunita Devi is pending.

4. Submission heard and record perused.

5. The Brief facts of the case is that on the alleged date of incident at about 8 p.m., the injured Sunita Devi was going to Sant

Nagar after performing daily rituals in the temple, and when she reached in front of house of Nem Singh, gali no.16, Sant Nagar, the accused Suman Devi W/of Mahesh Mehto, wife of Pappu and Babli W/o Krishan had restrained the way of complainant and beat her and the accused herein also dragged her and encouraged the lady to beat the injured Sunita Devi. Therefore, the present FIR came to be registered.

6. At this juncture, it would be apposite to reproduce the following extracts of ***Bhadresh Bipinbhai Sheth Vs. State of Gujarat & Anr., (2016) 1 Supreme Court Cases 152:-***

“(x) The following factors and parameters need to be taken into consideration while dealing with anticipatory bail:

(a) The nature and gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made;

(b) The antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether the accused has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a court in respect of any cognizable offence;

(c) The possibility of the applicant to flee from justice;

(d) The possibility of the accused's likelihood to repeat similar or other offences;

(e) Where the accusations have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her;

(f) Impact of grant of anticipatory bail particularly in cases of large magnitude affecting a very large number of people;

(g) The courts must evaluate the entire available material against the accused very carefully. The court must also clearly comprehend the exact role of the accused in the case. The cases in which the accused is implicated with the help of [Sections 34](#) and [149](#) of the Penal Code, 1860 the court should consider with even greater care and caution, because overimplication in the cases is a matter of common knowledge and concern;

(h) While considering the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, a balance has to be struck between two factors, namely, no prejudice should be caused to free, fair and full investigation, and there should be prevention of harassment, humiliation and unjustified detention of the accused;

(i) The Court should consider reasonable apprehension of tampering of the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant;

(j) Frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail and in the event of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of bail.”

7. During the course of arguments, when questioned about the nature of injuries caused to the Sunita Devi, it was averred that the 2-3 slaps were given to her. Further, perusal FIR would that beatings were given by three ladies namely Suman, Babli and wife of Pappu, and not by the applicant herein. During the course of

arguments, it was also brought to the fore that, the accused herein has clean antecedents and has never been previously involved in commission of any offence. It is thus apparent that no purpose would be served in incarcerating the accused at this juncture. Keeping in mind the age of the accused, role attributed by the accused persons and previous clean antecedents, this court is of the opinion that the accused be granted anticipatory bail. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the following conditions:

- a) In the event of arrest, he shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bond and surety bond of Rs. 20,000/- alongwith one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO concerned.
- b) The petitioner is directed not to leave the Country without prior permission of the Court.
- c) The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called for.
- d) The petitioner is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.
- e) The petitioner shall give his address to the IO and if he changes the address he shall intimate the same to the IO.
- f) The accused shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the accused is trying to contact him/her and trying to put pressure on him/her then the

protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.

8. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.

9. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2005/21

FIR NO. 254/2021

U/S 376 IPC

P.S. Burari

State Vs Saurabh Singh Thakur

05.08.2021

Vide Order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Wazirabad and Crime Branch of Central Police District through Video Conferencing Mode.

Second application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been filed on behalf of accused Saurabh Singh Thakur for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.

Sh. Anurag Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Sh. Sandeep Mishra, Ld. Counsel for complainant through VC.

IO/SI Satender Singh is present though VC.

Reply has been received from IO.

On the previous date of hearing, Ld. Counsel for complainant had raised the issue of maintainability of the present application. According to him, there is no change in the circumstances

since dismissal of previous anticipatory bail application, and thus, the present application is not maintainable. Ld. Additional PP for the State also concurred with the submissions of Ld. Counsel for complainant, and placed reliance upon the judgment **G.R. Ananda Babu Vs. State of Tamil Nadu [SLP (Crl.) No. 213 of 2021]**.

Per contra, Ld. Counsel for accused submitted that there were chat messages, a perusal of which would reveal that the present case is not one where sexual relations were established on the pretext of marriage
Submission heard.

During the course of arguments, it was submitted by the State that the said chat messages were in the knowledge of the accused at the time of filing of previous anticipatory bail application. Further, it is matter of record that the previous anticipatory bail application was adjudicated on merit vide order dated 19.07.2021 passed by this Court. During the course of arguments, it was submitted by the IO that accused never joined investigation and remained absconding, pursuant to which process under Section 82 Cr.P.C., was initiated against him.

At this juncture, it would be apposite to peruse the following extracts of **G.R. Ananda Babu (Supra)** wherein it is observed as under :

“As a matter of fact, successive anticipatory bail application ought not to be entertained and more so, when the case diary and the status report, clearly indicated that the accused (respondent No.2) is absconding and not co-operating with the investigation. The specious reason of change in

circumstances cannot be invoked for successive anticipatory bail applications, once it is rejected by a speaking order and that too by the same Judge.”

Thus, in light of the mandate of the above judgment, this Court concurs of the submissions of Ld. Counsel for complainant and Ld. Additional PP for the State. Under these circumstances, the present anticipatory bail application is hereby dismissed.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2018/21

FIR NO. 491/21

U/s 354/354B/341/323/34 IPC

P.S. Wazirabad

State Vs Shiv Kumar Mehto

05.08.2021

Vide Order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Wazirabad and Crime Branch of Central Police District through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been filed on behalf of accused Shiv Kumar Mehto for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.

Sh. Pradeep Maurya, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

IO/SI Ved Praksh is present through VC.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed

hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicant /accused submitted that applicant herein is the office bearer/member of Gauri Shankar Ram Janki Mandir Evam Parshhuram Mandir Samiti (Regd.). It was further submitted that Raj Kumar and Ram Bahadur as well as their associates of the miscreants named above are adopting all coercive and clever tactics and also forged and fabricated documents of the Mandir and are trying to grab the property of the Mandir. Lastly, it was submitted that applicant is aged about 59 years and is a respectable person and is living in the vicinity since last bout 35 years with clean and unblemished record and he has never been indulged in any wrong or illegal activity and it is the opposite party persons who in collusion with their associate ladies are out to harass, torture and black-mail him and other office bearers and to compel them not to see the management and control of the said Mandir Samiti. Therefore, he ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State alongwith the IO vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application. It has been submitted that MLC of complainant Sunita Devi is pending.

4. Submission heard and record perused.

5. The Brief facts of the case is that on the alleged date of incident at about 8 p.m., the injured Sunita Devi was going to Sant

Nagar after performing daily rituals in the temple, and when she reached in front of house of Nem Singh, gali no.16, Sant Nagar, the accused Suman Devi W/of Mahesh Mehto, wife of Pappu and Babli W/o Krishan had restrained the way of complainant and beat her and the accused herein also dragged her and encouraged the lady to beat the injured Sunita Devi. Therefore, the present FIR came to be registered.

6. At this juncture, it would be apposite to reproduce the following extracts of ***Bhadresh Bipinbhai Sheth Vs. State of Gujarat & Anr., (2016) 1 Supreme Court Cases 152:-***

“(x) The following factors and parameters need to be taken into consideration while dealing with anticipatory bail:

(a) The nature and gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made;

(b) The antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether the accused has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a court in respect of any cognizable offence;

(c) The possibility of the applicant to flee from justice;

(d) The possibility of the accused's likelihood to repeat similar or other offences;

(e) Where the accusations have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her;

(f) Impact of grant of anticipatory bail particularly in cases of large magnitude affecting a very large number of people;

(g) The courts must evaluate the entire available material against the accused very carefully. The court must also clearly comprehend the exact role of the accused in the case. The cases in which the accused is implicated with the help of [Sections 34](#) and [149](#) of the Penal Code, 1860 the court should consider with even greater care and caution, because overimplication in the cases is a matter of common knowledge and concern;

(h) While considering the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, a balance has to be struck between two factors, namely, no prejudice should be caused to free, fair and full investigation, and there should be prevention of harassment, humiliation and unjustified detention of the accused;

(i) The Court should consider reasonable apprehension of tampering of the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant;

(j) Frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail and in the event of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of bail.”

7. During the course of arguments, when questioned about the nature of injuries caused to the Sunita Devi, it was averred that the 2-3 slaps were given to her. Further, perusal FIR would that beatings were given by three ladies namely Suman, Babli and wife of Pappu, and not by the applicant herein. During the course of

arguments, it was also brought to the fore that, the accused herein has clean antecedents and has never been previously involved in commission of any offence. It is thus apparent that no purpose would be served in incarcerating the accused at this juncture. Keeping in mind the age of the accused, role attributed by the accused persons and previous clean antecedents, this court is of the opinion that the accused be granted anticipatory bail. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the following conditions:

- a) In the event of arrest, he shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bond and surety bond of Rs. 20,000/- alongwith one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO concerned.
- b) The petitioner is directed not to leave the Country without prior permission of the Court.
- c) The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called for.
- d) The petitioner is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.
- e) The petitioner shall give his address to the IO and if he changes the address he shall intimate the same to the IO.
- f) The accused shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the accused is trying to contact him/her and trying to put pressure on him/her then the

protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.

8. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.

9. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/05.08.2021