

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 1111 OF 2003

DHARAM DEO SHARMA Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF U.P. & ORS. Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for anticipatory bail)

Date: 26/06/2008 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P. SATHASIVAM
(VACATION BENCH)

For Appellant(s) Mr. Pradeep Misra, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. T.N. Singh, Adv.
For Mr. Kamendra Mishra, Adv.

Mr. K.B. Sounder Rajan, Adv (NP)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

(Ravi P. Verma)
Court Master

(Anand Singh)
Court Master

[Signed order is placed on the file]
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1111 OF 2003

DHARAM DEO SHARMA Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF U.P. & ORS. Respondent(s)

ORDER

When the appellant was serving as Superintending Engineer in U.P. Electricity Board, one Vimla Devi filed a complaint on 2.2.1998, alleging that she had been engaged by the appellant as a maid servant a few days earlier, that on 1.2.1998, the appellant gave her some tablet which made her unconscious and when she regained

consciousness she found that she had no clothes and that she was raped when she was unconscious. The police investigated and filed a report stating that no offence, as alleged, has been made out. The said Vimla Devi filed a protest petition. After hearing the protest petition, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saharanpur made an order on 31.8.1998 summoning the petitioner to face the charges. The appellant made an application for recalling the said order. The same was rejected by order dated 11.7.2000. The appellant filed a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. before the Allahabad High Court challenging the orders dated 31.8.1998 and

.....2.

-2-

11.7.2000. The High Court dismissed the petition by order dated 21.8.2000 holding that the petition was premature and the appellant could raise all contentions at the appropriate stage. The said order is challenged in this appeal filed by special leave.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that a false case has been set up against the appellant on account of the strict action taken by him against defaulting electricity consumers. He also submitted that the police had found that he had not committed the offence and his contentions were not considered by the learned Magistrate while ordering summons.

3. We find that the High Court found that it could not interfere with the summoning order, in view of the specific averment in the complaint. We also find that the High Court has safeguarded the interest of the appellant with the following observation:-

"However, considering the fact that the applicant has been summoned on the basis of the protest petition and he being Chief Engineer in the Electricity Department, is not likely to abscond, it is provided that in case the applicant surrenders and apply for

.....3.

-3-

bail in the aforesaid case, then his application shall be considered and disposed of by the courts below expeditiously in accordance with law preferable on the day."

We are told that subsequently the appellant has retired from service as Chief Engineer of the Electricity Board.

4. In the circumstance, we find no ground to interfere with the order. Therefore, we dispose of this appeal reiterating the observation that if the appellant surrenders and applies for bail, his application shall be considered and disposed of by the learned Magistrate on the same day having regard to the peculiar facts of the case.

.....J.
(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

.....J.
(P. SATHASIVAM)

NEW DELHI;
JUNE 26, 2008.