

---

**(2019) 12 DEL CK 0367**

**In the Delhi High Court**

**Case No : Bail Application No. 2925 Of 2019**

Rumit Kumar Maan

APPELLANT

Vs

State (Nct Of Delhi)

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision : 18-12-2019**

**Acts Referred:**

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 439

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 120B, 342, 382, 506

**Citation : (2019) 12 DEL CK 0367**

**Hon'ble Judges : Brijesh Sethi, J**

**Bench : Single Bench**

**Advocate : Siddharth Pandit, Aradhana Pandit, G. M. Farooqui**

**Final Decision : Dismissed**

---

## **Judgement**

Brijesh Sethi, J

1. Vide this order I shall dispose of a bail application filed u/s. 439 CrPC by the petitioner Rumit Maan in FIR No. 453/2019 u/s. 384/342/506/120-B IPC, P.S. Ashok Vihar.

2. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has prayed for bail on the ground that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated. It is submitted that petitioner is in JC since 23.10.2019 and no more required for the purpose of investigation. It is submitted that complainant has taken loan from Shri Ved Prakash Maan, paternal uncle of the petitioner and now matter has been settled between them and petitioner has nothing to do with the present dispute. The bank statement of Shri Ved Prakash Maan clearly shows that the complainant Pulkit Kundra has received the amount on various occasions in the year 2017-18 & 2018-19. It is submitted that present FIR has been registered in collusion with the local police to falsely implicate the petitioner in a criminal case. Petitioner is neither a hard core criminal nor an influential man. The petitioner had moved an application u/s 439 CrPC seeking regular bail before Ld. ASJ-04, North-West, Rohini Courts, New

Delhi. However the said application of the petitioner was dismissed by the Ld. Trial Court vide order dated 30.10.2019. It is submitted that since investigation has already been completed, in these circumstances, no fruitful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in JC. It is therefore, prayed that he be released on bail, in the interested of justice.

3. Ld. APP for the state has opposed the bail application on the ground that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He has, therefore prayed for dismissal of the bail application.

4. I have considered the rival submissions. Present case has been registered on the complaint of Mr. Pulkit Kundra against petitioner Rumiit Maan and co-accuseds Pravesh Maan, Suraj, Sanjay and Vikas Maan @ Vicky. Complainant has alleged that he is running an office of second hand Car Sale and Purchase. On 17.10.2019 at about 6 PM, petitioner along with his PSO and co-accused persons Pravesh Maan and Vikas Maan @ Vicky had come to his office and asked about the keys of AUDI A6 Car bearing No. DL-3CCR-1989. On refusal by the manager Tarun Tandon all of them threatened him. On 18.10.2019 at around 2 PM, petitioner along with his PSO and co-accused persons Vikas Ahlawat @ Vicky had come at his office and again demanded the key of the abovesaid Car. However, when manager Tarun Tandon refused to give the keys, after threatening them they left the office. On 19.10.2019 at around 2.30 PM, co-accuseds Sanjay @ Sanju and Vikash Maan @ Vicky along with PSO entered into the said office and demanded the key of the said Audi A6 Car. When Manager, Tarun Tandon refused to hand over the keys of the car, they threatened him, pulled him out from the office and forcibly pushed him into their black Scorpio bearing No. DL 8CAX 3715 which is registered in the name of petitioner. After some time they left him on the road near Keshav Puram Metro Station and also threatened him to not to disclose this incident to any one, otherwise they would kill him. Manager Tarun Tandon narrated this incident to his owner Sh. Pulkit Kundra on his mobile phone. The whole incident is captured in the CCTV Cameras. Petitioner Rumiit Maan was arrested and his vehicle i.e Scorpio bearing No. DL 8CAX 3715 and keys of AUDI Car were recovered from his possession. Keeping in view the above facts and allegations appearing on record against the petitioner, no grounds for bail are made out. The bail application is, therefore, dismissed.