

\$~4

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 724/2018**

MURUGAN @ ANNA Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr.Roshan Lal Saini, Advocate**

versus

STATE Respondent

Represented by: **Ms.Rajni Gupta, APP for the State
with SI Khajan Singh, PS Paharganj**

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA**

ORDER

% **16.08.2018**

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks bail in case FIR No.359/2014 under Sections 307/387/120-B IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act registered at PS Paharganj.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 6th August, 2014 and the trial is likely to take some more time but the main material witnesses have since been examined and there is no likelihood of tampering the evidence and further all the co-accused have been granted bail.

3. The abovenoted FIR was registered on the complaint of one Raju who stated that he was running a tour and travel agency at Paharganj. On 13th July, 2014 when he was sitting in his office, the petitioner came to him and demanded ₹1 lakh. On the refusal of the complainant to part with money,

BAIL APPLN. 724/2018

page 1 of 2

the petitioner threatened to kill him, whipped out a country made pistol and shot at him. Petitioner tried to again fire but in the meantime, brother of the complainant pushed him and thus the second shot could not be fired. The injured and his brother have been examined in Court who have supported the case of the prosecution. The version of the injured is corroborated by the testimony of Dr.Avinash Pal PW-18 who noted a gunshot injury on right leg below the knee on the complainant.

4. Status report has been filed. As per the status report, besides above noted FIR the petitioner is involved in 15 other cases. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in most of the cases the petitioner has been acquitted however the details of the cases reflect that the petitioner has been involved in cases under the Arms Act and Section 307/324/379 IPC besides NDPS Act as well.

5. Considering the statement of the complainant and that out of the total 25 witnesses to be examined by the prosecution, 20 have already been examined, this Court finds no ground to grant bail to the petitioner. However the petitioner is in custody since 6th August, 2014 and the trial is required to be expedited, learned Additional Sessions Judge is requested to expedite the trial and conclude the same preferably within a period of six months from today.

6. Copy of this order be communicated to the learned Trial Court.

7. Copy of this order be also communicated to the petitioner through Superintendent, Central Jail, Tihar.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

AUGUST 16, 2018/mamta
BAIL APPLN. 724/2018

page 2 of 2