

\$~3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1432/2018**

SULENDRU @ SONU Petitioner
Through Mr. Parmod Kumar, Mr. Dinesh
Kumar and Mr. Amod Kumar, Advs.

versus

THE STATE Respondent
Through Ms. Aashaa Tiwari, APP

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

% **ORDER**
04.07.2018

Crl. M.A. no.11509/2018 (exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Application is disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. No. 1432/2018

Petitioner was on bail. He is a permanent resident of Aligarh. In the bail bond, he had given his Delhi local address. In the charge-sheet, Aligarh has been mentioned as his permanent address. It is not the case that petitioner did not appear in the trial court during the trial. He did not appear in trial court on 20th February, 2018. Accordingly, non-bailable warrants were issued against the petitioner, besides notice under Section 446 Cr.P.C.

to the surety. Petitioner appeared in Court on 19th March, 2018 along with his surety. He was taken in custody. His bail application has been dismissed by the trial court. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that non-appearance of the petitioner on 20th February, 2018 was neither intentional nor wilful. Petitioner was under the impression that since his permanent address has been mentioned in the charge-sheet, he was not to file his Aligarh address again, after furnishing of the bail bond. Petitioner has learnt a lesson for his mistake. He is in custody for more than three months and may be released on bail.

Keeping in mind the facts and circumstances of this case, as detailed above, petitioner is admitted to bail, subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial court.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms. Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JULY 04, 2018
r.bararia