$~12

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 946/2018

RAM GYAN SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr.Rajat Aneja and Ms.Chandrika Gupta, Advocates

versus

THE STATE ..... Respondent

Represented by: Ms.Rajni Gupta, APP for the State with SI Jasbir Malik and ASI Arun Kumar, PS Ranhola

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

O R D E R

% 15.05.2018

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.244/2018 under Sections 323/341/325/308/34 IPC registered at PS Ranhola on the complaint of Uday-the injured victim. In the FIR it is alleged that there was dispute going on between family of Bhuvneshwar i.e. the son of the petitioner and his brother Satish on the installation of water and electricity meter as they were neighbours as Gyan Sharma with his sons was living on the upper ground floor whereas Satish, the brother of the complainant-victim was living on the second floor.

2. According to Uday, he had gone to the house of his brother Satish. At 11:30 PM when he was going back to his residence on his motorcycle at Ansari Chowk, Mohan Garden, Gaurav stopped him, whereafter Gaurav,

Bhuwneshwar @ Monti and Ram Gyan Sharma gave him blows by fist and dandas. They pinned him down and assaulted him. Thereafter Gaurav called three or four other associates who also started giving beatings to him. In the meantime, his brother Karan arrived at the spot and when he tried to intervene, Gaurav, Bhuvneshwar and Ram Gyan Sharma-petitioner herein and their associates gave beatings to both the brothers. It is further alleged that the complainant was having ₹4,500/- in his purse and was wearing a ring of gold which was taken away by Gaurav. In the meantime their elder brother Satish came, whereafter the accused ran away and Satish took both the brothers to the hospital. Version of Udai is also corroborated by Karan, his younger brother who has also received injuries. The opinion on the MLC of Udai is that he has received grievous injuries whereas despite the tooth of Karan being broken, his injuries have been opined to be simple in nature which apparently is incorrect.

3. Considering that this Court is not dealing with the applications of Gaurav and Bhuvnehswar but only of Ram Gyan Sharma who is the father of Bhuvneshwar and a senior citizen aged about 60 years, this Court deems it fit to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. It is therefore directed that in the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety bond of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/SHO concerned further subject to the condition that he will join the investigation as and when directed by the Investigating Officer and in case of change of residential address, the same will be intimated to the Court concerned by way of an affidavit.

4. Petition is disposed of.

5. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

MAY 15, 2018
mamta