

\$~69

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 603/2016**

AFROZ

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms.Shimpy Arman Sharma,
Advocate.

versus

THE STATE OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Ms.Alpana Pandey, APP for the State
with Insp. Harender, PS Welcome.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

18.03.2016

Crl.M.A. No.4804/2016

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 603/2016

1. By filing the present bail application, the petitioner is praying for extension of interim bail granted to her by this Court vide order dated 17.02.2016 passed in Bail Appln. No.297/2016.
2. Heard.
3. Vide order dated 17.02.2016, the petitioner has been granted interim bail for a period of three weeks on the ground of marriage of her daughter.
4. In the application seeking extension of parole, it is alleged that Abdul Sharukh, aged 10 years is suffering from various ailments and mental diseases in the absence of his mother i.e. the petitioner. He is under treatment. He has been taken to IBHAS on 27.2.2016 as well on 3.3.2016

and 8.3.2016 and has been referred to neurology department as he has got seizure disease. He has been referred to mental challenged department where the doctor has directed to report on 30.3.2016 and to continue the treatment.

5. The treatment record annexed by the petition seeking extension of interim bail does not disclose that the son of the petitioner has suffered ailment during the pendency of the interim bail granted to the petitioner for the purpose of marriage of her daughter. The interim bail granted to the petitioner has already expired on 11.3.2016 and it appears that she has not surrendered till date and this petition has been filed for extension which has come up for hearing today.

6. In the application, prayer for extension of the interim bail has been sought for four months without disclosing as to whether child will recover within four months. Some of the family member must have been taking care of the child before she was ordered to be released on interim bail for the purpose of marriage of her daughter.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case that the petitioner has already availed interim bail for a period of three weeks vide order dated 17.02.2016 passed in Bail Appln. No.297/2016, I do not find any ground to extend the interim bail granted to the petitioner which has already expired a week before this matter could be listed for hearing. The prayer of the petitioner for extension of interim bail is declined.

6. Application is dismissed. If not surrendered, the petitioner shall surrender immediately.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

MARCH 18, 2016/ 'st'/'hkaur'
BAIL APPLN. 603/2016

page 1 of 2