

\$~B.A. - 1

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1339/2020**

ATUL SHOKEEN

.....Petitioner

Through Mr. A.K. Chhikara, Adv.

versus

STATE

.....Respondent

Through Mr. Ravi Nayak, APP for State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

01.07.2020

%

[Court hearing convened *via* video-conferencing on account of COVID-19]

1. Mr. Ravi Nayak, who appears on behalf of the State, says that investigations against the petitioner are still on.
2. The petitioner is accused of having committed offences under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.
3. I may indicate that it is the submission of the counsel for the petitioner i.e. Mr. A.K. Chhikara, that there is no direct evidence against the petitioner *qua* the commission of the alleged offences.
 - 3.1 It is also the submission of Mr. Chhikara that the petitioner has no past criminal record and being a young person of 22 years, he ought to be enlarged on bail.
4. Mr. Nayak, on the other hand, submits that the Investigating Officer [in short "I.O."] is hopeful of completing the investigation in the matter in another three weeks or so.

BAIL APPLN. 1339/2020

1/2

Signature Not Verified

digitally signed by VIPIN
KUMAR RAY
signing date 01.07.2020
23:16

5. Thus, given the fact that the investigations are still on and the accusation against the petitioner is grave, I am not inclined, for the moment, to grant relief, as prayed for, in the petition.

6. The petitioner will have liberty though to move the Court once the charge-sheet is filed.

7. The captioned bail application is, accordingly, disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JULY 01, 2020

pmc/KK

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)

BAIL APPLN. 1339/2020

2/2

Signature Not Verified

digitally signed by VIPIN
KUMAR RAY
signing date 01.07.2020
23:16