

\$~42.

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 237/2017**

SURESH KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dharam Raj Ohlan, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Akshai Malik, APP along with
Inspector Uma Datt, PS – Mangol
Puri, for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER

07.02.2017

%

Crl. M.A. No. 2194/2017

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 237/2017

Though the petitioner has preferred this bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. to seek regular bail, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, states that the grievance of the petitioner is primarily that the Trial Court has directed recording of all the evidence of the formal witnesses before examining the relatives of the deceased and other independent

witnesses.

This grievance of the petitioner appears to be justified. The Trial Court should first record the evidence of the material and independent/public witnesses so that the bail application of the petitioner could be considered. The Trial Court is, accordingly, directed to first record their evidence. After the evidence has been recorded, the petitioner may move an application for bail.

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Dasti.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2017

B.S. Rohella