

\$~34.

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1576/2016**

HARVINDER THAKRAN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. D.S. Kohli & Mr. Aashneet
Singh, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Katyal, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER
05.08.2016

%

Crl.M.A. No.11936/2016

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 1576/2016 and Crl.M.A. No.11935/2016

Issue notice. Mr. Katyal accepts notice.

The applicant seeks bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. The applicant has been tried along with other co-accused under Section 364A/ 365/ 368/ 392/ 411/ 34/ 120B of the IPC and Section 25/ 27 of the Arms Act.

The submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that so far as the applicant is concerned, the only role attributed to him is that he provided

food for the victim/ kidnapped boy at the place where he was kept. He states that no other role has been ascribed to the applicant. He has referred to the testimony of PW-7 in this regard.

This was a case of 17-year old boy being kidnapped for ransom. The father of the victim had informed the police and a trap was laid to nab the culprits by leaving a GPRS device in the bag in which the ransom amount of Rs.80 Lakhs was put and delivered. In that manner, the accused were apprehended and recovery of major part of the money was also made. The mobile phone call records of the applicant and the other co-accused shows that the applicant was in constant touch with the other co-accused, who may be instrumental in the kidnapping of the victim. The prosecution has invoked Section 34 and 120B, as aforesaid. The prosecution evidence is still being recorded.

In these circumstances, the role of the applicant cannot be viewed narrowly. I find no merit in this bail application.

Dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

AUGUST 05, 2016

B.S. Rohella