

\$~34.

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 91/2017**

VIRENDER CHAND

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. K.S. Sharma, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Katyal, APP along with SI
Satish Kumar, for the State.

Mr. Manoranjan Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER

18.01.2017

%

Crl. M.A. No.926/2017

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 91/2017

Issue notice. Mr. Katyal accepts notice. He has tendered a status report in Court, which is taken on record.

The petitioner has filed the present bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. to seek regular bail in case FIR No.358/2016 under Section 307/ 34 IPC registered at PS – Govindpuri. The petitioner is in judicial custody

since 07.05.2016.

From the status report, it is seen that the examination of the injured is yet to take place. So far as the petitioner is concerned, the role attributed to him is that he being the maternal uncle of the main accused Mahender, who along with Satender gave injuries to the victim, had taken them in his three-wheeler on the date of the incident as well as on the previous day to conduct a recky. Moreover, he also hid his three-wheeler when he had gone to the police station to enquire about the main accused Mahender. The case against the petitioner is premised on a CCTV footage relied upon by the prosecution.

The involvement of the petitioner at this stage cannot be ruled out. Since the victim is yet to be examined, I am not inclined to entertain the bail application at this stage. It shall be open to the petitioner to apply for bail again after the victim and the independent witnesses, if any, are examined.

Dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

JANUARY 18, 2017

B.S. Rohella