



\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 3185/2024**

DEEPAK

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Purshotam Saharawat, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State
along with Inspector Devendra P.S.
Mundka.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

29.11.2024

%

1. By way of the present application under Section 483 of the BNSS, the applicant seeks regular bail in FIR No. 513/2024 registered at P.S. Mundka for the offences punishable under Sections 309(4)/311/3(5) BNS.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant is in custody since 19.07.2024. He submits that the applicant has been illegally framed in the present case. He also submits that on the applicant's arrest, IO has made recovery of some documents; however, those documents have not been alleged to be robbed from the complainant and that the alleged recovery does not prove the case against the applicant. Learned Counsel also refers to a newspaper clipping to submit that the status report filed by the IO is contrary to the said clipping on the aspect of the place of arrest. While the newspaper clipping states that he was arrested from a drain near



Sultan Majra, the Status Report shows that the applicant was arrested from near his house. It is further stated that co-accused has still not been arrested. Lastly, it is stated that the applicant has neither robbed the complainant nor has the weapon of offence been recovered.

3. The status report has been placed on record. A reading of same would show that the complainant has alleged that on 06.07.2024, three persons aged 25-30 years entered the warehouse at about 01:30 PM. So far as the present applicant is concerned, he was stated to be wearing red colour t-shirt. The complainant has also stated that all three persons were having pistols in their hands. The status report further states that on applicant's arrest, the said red colour t-shirt worn by him at the time of incident was recovered. During TIP, the applicant has been identified and there is also CCTV footage with regards to the incident.

4. Although it is contended that the applicant has married inter-caste and thus he has been illegally framed by his father-in-law, in light of the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the material collected, I find no ground to grant regular bail.

5. Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

NOVEMBER 29, 2024/ssc