

\$~1

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 2233/2020
CRL. MA. 11178/2020 (exemption from filing certified/true copies
and attested affidavits)

ANGEL GUPTA Petitioner
Represented by: Mr.Joginder Tuli, Advocate.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI Respondent
Represented by: Ms.Meenakshi Chauhan, APP for
State.
Mr.C.M.Sangwan, Advocate for the
complainant.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER
% **19.08.2020**

The hearing has been conducted through Video Conferencing.

CRL. MA. 11178/2020 (exemption from filing certified/true copies and
attested affidavits)

1. Exemption allowed subject to just exceptions. Attested affidavits in
support of the petition and the application be filed within one week of the
resumption of the normal Court functioning.

2. Application is disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 2233/2020

1. Notice. Learned APP for the State accepts notice.

2. This is the third bail application filed by the petitioner seeking interim bail in case FIR No. 430/2018 under Sections 302/34/120B IPC & 25/27 of the Arms Act registered at P.S. Bawana for a period for thirty days on the ground that the marriage of the petitioner is fixed for 20th September, 2020.
3. The earlier bail applications of the petitioner being Bail Application Nos. 888/2020 and 1081/2020 seeking interim bail on the same grounds were disposed of i.e. the first one was withdrawn and the second bail application was dismissed by this Court.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the change in circumstance which entails the petitioner to be granted interim bail is that the co-accused Manjeet Sehrawat who was the main accused in the matter, was granted three days interim bail by this Court rejecting the contention that he would win over his daughter Dakshita or the other witnesses. Learned counsel for the petitioner also states that the voice sample of the petitioner has been taken by the Investigating Officer on 24th July, 2020.
5. This Court has gone through the order granting interim bail to Manjeet Sehrawat was granted interim bail for the reason that his father's surgery had to be performed which involved amputation of a finger and thus, hospital stay was for a period of 3-4 days as the father was suffering from Diabetes, Hypertension and Lung infection and it is in view of this critical condition of the father that the petitioner therein was granted limited window of three days so that he could take care of father in the hospital. Thus, the petitioner cannot claim parity as the fixing of the marriage is an act of volition and can be performed later as well. Till the material witnesses are not examined, this Court is not inclined to grant interim bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.
7. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

AUGUST 19, 2020
akb