

\$~9

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2075/2016**

RINKU & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Represented by: Mr.M.K.Singh, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr.Ravi Nayak, APP for the
State with SI Karanpal Singh,
PS Anand Parbat

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

04.11.2016

%

By the present petition the two petitioners Rinku and Krishna both sons of Hira Nand seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No.244/2016 under Sections 452/323/506/427/34 IPC registered at Police Station Anand Parbat.

In the FIR, complainant Kamta Prasad Giri alleged that he was residing at F-157, Holi Chowk, Punjabi Basti, Baljeet Nagar, Delhi and on 12th May, 2016 he found Rinku and his friend Dev Narayan's son were consuming liquor in front of his shop. When he objected to it, they went away. After sometime they knocked the door of the complainant whereupon the brother-in-law of the complainant opened the door and accused Rinku and his brother Krishna, i.e., the two petitioners herein and his friend Dev Narain's son and Hiranand entered the house of the complainant with Lathis and Dandas and started beating him. When the complainant's brother and

BAIL APPLN. 2075/2016

Page 1 of 2

complainant. Brother-in-law of the complainant tried to intervene, but they were also beaten up with Danda and lathis resulting in injuries. While leaving the house, they damaged the motorcycle of the complainant parked in front of his house and threatened that they would teach him a lesson and would kill him if he made any complaint of this incident to the police.

As per the status report, the final opinion on the MLC is awaited and recovery of dandas and lathis is to be made from the petitioners. Status report further reveals that the petitioner Rinku is involved in three other cases being FIR Nos.605/2015, 353/2015 under Section 308 IPC and FIR No. 674/2015 under Sections 323/341/34 IPC. Further the petitioner No.2 Krishna is also involved in FIR No.89/2016 under Sections 354A/509/34 IPC.

Considering the allegations against the petitioners and their involvements, I find no reason to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Petition is accordingly dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

NOVEMBER 04, 2016
‘sv’