

**Lakshya vs.the State**

**Lakshya vs.the State**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/1221499](http://sooperkanoon.com/1221499)

**Court :** Delhi

**Decided On :** Feb-18-2019

**Appellant :** Lakshya

**Respondent :** The State

**Judgement :**

\$~3 \* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI % + Judgment delivered on:

18. 02.2019 BAIL APPLN. 756/2018 LAKSHYA versus THE STATE .....

... Petitioner

..... Respondent Advocates who appeared in this case: For the

... Petitioner

: For the Respondent: Mr.Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, Advocate. Mr.Hirein Sharma, APP for the State with SI Pankaj, P.S.Kirti Nagar. CORAM:-

"HONBLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA JUDGMENT SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J.

(ORAL) 1.

... Petitioner

seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.2124/2018 under Sections 379/4 IPC, Police Station Kirti Nagar.

2. The subject FIR was registered on the complaint of the owner of the vehicle who stated that he had parked the vehicle in front of his house and subsequently found that the vehicle had been stolen.

3. As per the case of the prosecution, the person who had stolen the vehicle approached the complainant and assured recovery of some of the goods which were in the vehicle. The co-accused was apprehended and in his disclosure statement he has named the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been 4. BAIL APPLN. 756/2018 Page 1 of 2 falsely implicated. He submits that there is no material on record to connect the petitioner with the subject offence except for the alleged disclosure statement of the co-accused. He further submits that there is no recovery from the petitioner or recovery at the behest of the petitioner. He further submits that admittedly the stolen vehicle has been recovered but the same has not been recovered from the petitioner or at his pointing out.

5. By order dated 09.04.2018 petitioner was granted interim protection subject to joining investigation. Learned APP submits that investigation is complete and charge sheet is in the process of being finalised for being filed in the Court. He submits that the petitioner had joined investigation.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances, I am satisfied that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the arresting officer/IO/SHO shall release the petitioner on bail on his furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Investigating Officer/SHO concerned.

... Petitioner

shall not do anything which may prejudice either the investigation, trial or the prosecution witnesses.

7. 8. Petition is allowed in the above terms. Order Dasti under signatures of the Court Master. FEBRUARY18 2019/rk SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J BAIL APPLN. 756/2018 Page 2 of 2

**SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - [sooperkanoon.com](http://sooperkanoon.com)**