

\$~55

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1033/2016 & CrI. M.A. 8212/2016**

SACHIN YADAV

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Surinder Kumar, Ms.Jyotsana
Gupta and Ms.Kajal, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr.Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State
with SI Dharmendra Pratap Singh, PS
Samaipur Badli, Delhi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

18.05.2016

1. By way of this bail application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 95/2016, under Section 308/34 IPC, registered at PS Samaipur Badli.
2. Notice. Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State accepts notice.
3. Learned APP for the State has placed on record the copy of the order dated 10th March, 2016, passed in Bail Appl. No. 536/2016 by the coordinate bench wherein the following order was passed:

"CrI.M.A. No.4286/2016

Exemption allowed subject to just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. No.536/2016

The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in a case arising out of FIR No.95/2016 registered under Section 308/34 of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Samaipur Badli.

It has been alleged in the FIR that there arose a quarrel between the accused and the complainant on account of placing the vehicle in the way of the accused. The accused Sachin along with three-four boys came out and asked him to move the vehicle from that place. The complainant in the complaint informed that there was fault in the vehicle and that he alone was unable to move the vehicle. On this, the accused Sachin took a danda from vehicle and hit on the head of the complainant with force. The fellow of the accused Sachin also gave several danda blows on the head and back of the complainant leaving the complainant half dead. Consequently, the FIR was lodged by the complainant.

I have learned counsel for the parties and perused the available record. I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

This bail application is dismissed.”

4. In this bail application the petitioner has place on record the copy of the order dated 30th March, 2016, passed in W.P.(Crl.) 1026/2016, but withheld the order dated 10th March, 2016 passed in Bail Appl. 536/2016.
5. For the reasons recorded in the Bail application No. 536/2016 passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice, P.S. Teji and that the petitioner has with-held this order from this Court while filing its bail application, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.
6. Bail application is dismissed.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

MAY 18, 2016

'hkaur'