

\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 2695/2016**

VIKRAM Petitioner
Through: Mr. M. B. Harikant, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT DELHI Respondent
Through: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for the State with
SI Kuldeep, PS-Bhalsawa Dairy.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

% **ORDER**
30.12.2016

CM APPL. No. 20340/2016

Exemption allowed subject to just exception.

Application stands disposed of.

Bail Appl. No. 2695/2016

This is an application under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 moved on behalf of the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail.

Mr. M. B. Harikant, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the name of the petitioner has neither been mentioned in the FIR No. 108/2016, PS-Bhalsawa Dairy nor he has been assigned any role in the alleged crime.

At the same time, Ms. Rajni Gupta, the learned APP for the State submits that Vikram and Sonu are one and the same person and their parentage is same.

I have heard arguments of both the counsel for sometime and also perused the material available on record.

Perusal of the order dated 16.12.2016 passed by the Mr. M. R. Sethi, Spl. Judge, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi shows that bail application was dismissed on the ground that the complainant received injury on his head and fracture on left knee and also on the ground that the petitioner is absconding and proceedings under Section 82 of Code of Criminal Procedure has been initiated. I further found that the name of the petitioner has been specifically mentioned in the FIR.

In view of the above, I find no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Accordingly, the prayer made in the application is declined.

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J

DECEMBER 30, 2016

gr