

10# \$~

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 680/2016**

VICKY

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr. Jitender Kumar, Advocate.**

versus

STATE (GNCT DELHI)

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for the
State with SI Ravi Kumar, PS
Domestic Airport and SI
Ramesh Kumar, PS Sultanpuri.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

03.11.2016

%

1. By the present petition the petitioner seeks bail in case FIR No. 35/2016 under Sections 307/147/148/149/34 IPC registered at PS Sultanpuri, Delhi.

2. The FIR was registered on the complaint of Aman who stated that on 12th January, 2016 at about 10.00 PM he along with his friend Vikas came to Sultanpuri from Shakurpur and were parking their vehicle in the park. There he noticed Vijay s/o Nanuram, his sons Akshay and Karan, brother in law of Akshay namely Arun and cousins of Karan namely Vicky, Ajay @ Ajju and Sunny. All these persons were consuming alcohol in the park. Karan threw empty bottle of wine on the Ecco car of the complainant to instigate them. When they opposed, all these seven persons beat up Vikas. Vicky, Karan and Akshay took out knives carried by each one of them. Vikas escaped

BAIL APPLN. 680/2016

Page 1 of 2

from their clutches but he was chased and caught by the accused persons. Thereafter, Vicky, Karan and Akshay inflicted knife blows on his chest and stomach and thereafter ran towards their house. Vikas was taken to the hospital by one of the eye witness and the victim's father took the PCR officials to the house of the alleged persons.

3. As per the MLC of Vikas, he sustained three incised wounds, one on the left side of chest on the upper part, one on the left side of the abdomen middle part and one on the left iliac crest. It is thus evident that all the three stab injuries were on the vital part of the injured and the petitioner was one of the main assailants. The injured was hospitalised for ten days and had to undergo surgery. During investigation, knife was also recovered at the instance of the petitioner.

4. Considering the allegations against the petitioner and the fact that the complainant and other eye-witnesses are yet to be examined, I find no reason to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

5. Bail application is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

NOVEMBER 03, 2016
'vn'