

\$~17

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1012/2017**

MANISH

..... Petitioner

Through

Mr. R.K. Bachachan and Mr. Sivhnu
Sharna, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through

Mr. Izhar Ahmad, Addl. PP for State
with ASI Rajender Kumar, Crime
Branch.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

%

16.06.2017

CRL. M.A. 9888/2017 (early hearing)

Heard. Allowed. Application stands disposed off
accordingly.

BAIL APPLN. 1012/2017

Status report has come to be handed over. Copy was supplied
in the earlier part of the day.

By the application, the applicant has sought interim bail for two
months on the premise that his child is born and that, while his wife
i.e. the mother of the child is anemic, the child is suffering from
bronchitis and jaundice. It is also stated that though, the applicant
had earlier filed interim bail for the purpose of delivery of the child
from 5.5.2017 to 19.5.2017, the delivery took place only on

24.5.2017.

As per the allegations, the applicant was one of the person, who robbed the complainant of Rs.1.40 crores at gun point from his shop. During TIP, the applicant is said to have been duly identified. Some recovery of money is also alleged from the applicant. Allegations are serious. Public witnesses are yet to be examined. Child has already come to be delivered on 24.5.2017 and as per the discharge summary of the child dated 12.6.2017, the child was though admitted with the complaint of fast breathing for two days, the fact remains that after the treatment, the child was discharged. In other words, there is no material on record that after the discharge, there is any situation for which the attendance of the applicant is required to attend to his wife and the child. As per the status report, brother-in-law of the applicant is looking after his wife, besides providing financial help. Certificate of the wife for her being anemic *ipso facto* cannot be construed to be such, which requires emergent attendance of the applicant.

Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances, I do not find any merit in the application especially, when the public witnesses are yet to be examined.

Dismissed.

A. K. CHAWLA, J
(Vacation Judge)

JUNE 16, 2017

rc