

I- 19 & 20

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

Date of Decision: May 18, 2015

+ **BAIL APPLN. 918/2015 & Crl. M.A.No.7337/2015**

ANKIT CHHIKARA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Ravin Rao,
Advocate

versus

STATE Respondent

Through: Mr. Navin Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State with ASI Hari Om
Complainant in person

+ **BAIL APPLN. 919/2015 & Crl. M.A.No.7338/2015**

NAVEEN CHAUHAN Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Ravin Rao,
Advocate

versus

STATE Respondent

Through: Mr. Navin Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State with ASI Hari Om
Complainant in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

%

ORDER
(ORAL)

In the above captioned applications, *pre-arrest bail* is sought by petitioners in FIR No. 299/2015, under Section 307/34 of the IPC, registered at police station Moti Nagar, West Delhi.

Notice.

Mr. Navin Sharma, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State accepts notice.

Since both these applications arise out of one FIR, therefore, these applications were heard together and are being disposed of by this common judgment.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that the injured- complainant/ first-informant of this FIR is present in the Court and he submits that he had suffered injury by fall and not at the hands of petitioners and that another injured- *Aman* had suffered only simple injuries in this incident.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that petitioners are required for investigation.

Learned senior counsel for petitioners submits that petitioners would be appearing before the Investigating Officer of this case on 19th May, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. and thereafter as and when called.

Without commenting on the merits of this case, it is directed that in the event of arrest, petitioners be admitted to bail in this case on their furnishing bail bond in the sum of ₹25,000/-each with one local surety each in the like amount to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer

concerned. It is made clear that if petitioners fail to join investigation as and when directed, then respondent –State would be at liberty to get this order revoked.

The above captioned applications are disposed of in aforesaid terms.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MAY 18, 2015

r