

\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

BAIL APPLN. 2615/2017

GURMEET SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Jayant Sood, Sr. Adv with Mr.
Piyush Singhal, Mr. Deepak Bansal
and Mr. Honey Khanna, Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Kewal Singh Ahuja, APP for the
State with SI Sushil Sanwania,
P.S.Defence Colony.
Complainant with his counsel Mr.
Mohit Gupta, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

03.01.2018

The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 12.12.2017. FIR has been registered under Section 307 of the IPC on the complaint of Sukhwinder Singh.

The averments in the FIR have been perused. The parties were known to one another. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner points out that the wife of the petitioner is estranged from him and is in fact living with the complainant and it was at the behest of the complainant that this incident had occurred. Submission is that a simple injury has been suffered by the complainant whereas the petitioner has suffered grievous injury and to substantiate his

submission, he has placed on record his medical record. The medical record placed on record is not in dispute. This medical record of the petitioner reflects that the petitioner was suffering from osteosarcoma of the right knee and an implant had also been implanted in his right knee. In this altercation, the screw in the tibial implant was unscrewed which had led to grievous injury having been suffered by the petitioner. The fact that the complainant suffered a simple injury is also not in dispute. The weapon used by the petitioner which as per the petitioner is a licensed weapon which the petitioner carries and which license he had obtained in the year 1992. The fact about the weapon is licensed is not disputed by the learned APP for the State.

Learned counsel for the complainant however denies the submission made by the petitioner that it was at the behest of the wife of the complainant that this incident had occurred. Submission is that the wife of the petitioner is like a sister to him. Parties are otherwise admittedly well known to each other. The complainant is also present. He admits that he knows the petitioner for the last 30 years.

Noting the above narration of facts and the fact that since the trial is yet going to take time, petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of ₹20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court.

Petition disposed of.

Order dasti.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JANUARY 03, 2018

A