

\$~49

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 643/2020**

SUKASH @ SUKESH CHANDRASHEKAR Petitioner

Through: Mr Mahesh Jethmalani, Sr. Advocate
with Mr Mayank Tripathi, Ms
Mugdha Pande and Mr Akash
Godhvani, Advocates.

Versus

STATE Respondent

Through: Ms Kusum Dhalla, APP for State with
Insp. Ritesh, SI Dheeraj, ISC/Crime.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

05.03.2020

CRL.M.A. 4892/2020

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 643/2020

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that he be granted bail in connection with FIR No.0056/2017 under Section 8 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 registered with PS Crime Branch, Delhi.

3. It is seen that the petitioner had filed a similar application (Bail Application No.579/2019), which was decided by a co-ordinate bench this Court by an order dated 31.05.2019. This Court had declined the petitioner's request after observing that there were good reasons not to grant bail. The Court observed that there was high likelihood of the petitioner trying to

influence the trial. This was in the context of the serious allegations made against the petitioner. It is alleged that a forged identity card of a Member of Parliament and a forged sticker of a Member of Parliament affixed to the car, was found. It is also alleged that the petitioner had sought to impersonate himself as the PA to the Law Minister as well as a Judge of the Supreme Court, to try and influence the learned Special Judge, PC Act.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that there has been a change in the circumstances inasmuch as, the proceedings before the trial court have been stayed by an order dated 30.09.2019 passed in CrI. Rev. P. 1140/2019. It is seen that this was in view of the fact that the Supreme Court had stayed the proceedings *qua* another co-accused. The proceedings have been stayed at the instance of the petitioner and clearly, no benefit can be granted to the petitioner by virtue of the said order.

5. This Court is not persuaded to accept a view different from the one that was expressed by this Court in its order dated 31.05.2019. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

MARCH 05, 2020
MK