

\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

BAIL APPLN. 2651/2017

SONU @ YOGESH @ BUDDA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr M.K. Khan, Adv

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through Ms.Neelam Sharma, APP for the
State with SI Ramakant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

06.02.2018

Petitioner is seeking regular bail. He is stated to be in custody since 27.08.2017. Charge has since been framed on 01.02.2018. The charge framed against the present petitioner is under Section 307/120B r/w S. 34 IPC. The FIR has been perused. The contents of the status report have also been perused. What has been reflected is that it was on the statement of the co-accused Manish @ Mogali that the role of the present petitioner is surfaced and pursuant to which the present petitioner was arrested. Admittedly, no recovery had been effected from the present petitioner. As per the disclosure statement of Manish @ Mogali the petitioner had stated that he would arrange for the money which was to be paid in a land dispute inter se the parties. This is also the case of the prosecution that the petitioner was not present at the spot where the incident had occurred. The trial is

yet going to take time.

Without delving any further into the merits of the controversy and noting that any observation made in this order will not reflect upon its merit, this is a fit case that the petitioner, noting the period of custody which he has undergone, be admitted on bail. Accordingly, petitioner is admitted to bail on furnishing of his personal bond in the sum of Rs 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned trial court. He undertakes to appear before the trial Court on all dates as and when matter is called for hearing (unless specifically exempted); he shall not try to influence witnesses in any manner.

Petition disposed of in the above terms.

Order *dasti*.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

FEBRUARY 06, 2018

SU