

\$~7

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2536/2015**

JAMIL

..... Petitioner

Through: **Mr.S.K.Rai, Advocate.**

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: **Ms.Alpana Pandey, APP for the State
with SI Sunil Kumar, PS Govind Puri.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

20.01.2016

%

1. By filing the present application under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioner is seeking bail in case FIR No.966/2015 under Sections 452/308/323 IPC, PS Govind Puri, Delhi.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned APP for the State.

3. Mr.S.K.Rai, Advocate for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody for almost six months despite the fact that the MLC shows simple injuries being received by the complainant Munni Devi. Further as per the MLC, simple injuries allegedly received by Raman - the son-in-law of complainant Smt.Munni Devi, is stated to have been received in RTA and not in this incident. It has been further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that all the injured persons were discharged on the same day and in view of the time likely to take in concluding the time as

well as the period of detention already spent by the present petitioner in judicial custody, he may be enlarged on bail.

4. Perusal of the FIR shows that the petitioner is neighbour of the complainant. Injured Raman is son-in-law of the complainant Smt.Munni Devi and there was some discussion between him and the petitioner over purchase of a mobile to the disliking of complainant. There are allegations in the complaint of stone pelting and Raman and Surender allegedly receiving injuries in this incident as well PCR being informed by her son-in-law.

5. Without making any observation on the issue as to whether Raman receiving injuries in RTA or in this assault, I am of the opinion that in view of the nature of injuries, which did not require any treatment as indoor patient, as well the fact that he has already spent six months in custody, it is a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Thus, it is directed that the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned, with the condition that he will not try to contact or influence the complainant/witnesses.

6. Bail application stands disposed of.

As prayed, copy of the order be given dasti to learned counsel for the parties.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JANUARY 20, 2016

‘st’