

§~7 & 8

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ BAIL APPLN. 1211/2017

ANJU DEVI

Through: Mr.Kundan Kumar, Mr.Atul Sareen
and Mr.Ajay Kumar Saini,
Advocates. Petitioner

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI)

Through: Mr.Kewal Singh Ahuja, APP for the
State. Respondent

AND

+ BAIL APPLN. 1213/2017

PREETI

Through: Mr.Kundan Kumar, Mr.Atul Sareen
and Mr.Ajay Kumar Saini,
Advocates. Petitioner

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI)

Through: Mr.Kewal Singh Ahuja, APP for the
State. Respondent

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **10.07.2017**

1. By filing these two bail applications, the applicants/petitioners Anju Devi and Preeti are seeking bail in case FIR No.162/2017 under Section 307/34 IPC, PS North Rohini, Delhi.

BAIL APPLN. Nos.1211 & 1213 of 2017

Page 1 of 3

u

2. Perusal of the record shows that though the bail applications were filed by the petitioners under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in the above noted FIR, however, on the last date of hearing i.e. 23rd June, 2017 at the request of learned counsel for the petitioners, the bail applications were treated as one under Section 439 Cr.P.C.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that Ms. Anu Jain – the complainant in this case is an Advocate and the FIR No.162/2017 was registered in respect of a quarrel that took place between the neighbours. The incident was videographed by son of the complainant. Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that the injuries suffered by the complainant was opined to be 'simple'. Both the petitioners have already remained in judicial custody for a period of 26 days and they were granted interim bail for a period of four weeks by the learned ASJ to enable the parties to arrive at a settlement. Since settlement could not take place between the parties, the interim bail granted by learned ASJ vide order 06th May, 2017 was not further extended and their bail application were dismissed.

4. Thereafter, the instant bail applications were filed before this Court by both the petitioners and on 23rd June, 2017 this Court admitted both the petitioners on bail till the next date of hearing i.e. today, on their each furnishing personal bond in the sum of ₹10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned MM concerned/Duty MM.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in view of the period already spent by the petitioners for the injuries allegedly caused to the complainant as well as the fact that the parties were neighbour and

5

interim bail was granted to the petitioners for a period of four weeks to enable them to arrived at an amicable settlement, which could not take place and due to that reason, the bail applications were dismissed by the learned ASJ, the petitioners may be enlarged on bail.

6. The complainant, who is present in person alongwith learned APP for the State, has shown certain photographs showing the marks of injury on her person.

7. On being questioned by the Court, it is not disputed by the complainant that the nature of injuries suffered by her was opined to be 'simple' and she was discharged from the hospital on the same day.

8. Looking into the above circumstances, the order dated 23rd June, 2017 by this Court, whereby interim bail was granted to the petitioners till today, is confirmed.

9. The petitioners are admitted to bail on their each furnishing personal bond in the sum of ₹10,000/- with one surety each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Link Court.

10. Both the applications are allowed.

11. As prayed, copy of the order be given dasti to learned counsel for the parties and be also sent to the concerned Court as well to the concerned Jail Superintendent for information and compliance.

JULY 10, 2017

'st'


PRATIBHA RANI, J.