



\$~12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 3558/2024**
MUKESHPetitioner

Through: Counsel (appearance not given).

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr.Laksh Khanna, APP for State with
SI Ghanshyam, PS Pul Prahladpur.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER
16.10.2024

%

1. By way of the present application, the petitioner/applicant seeks regular bail in FIR No. 188/2024 registered under Sections 368/370/34 IPC and Section 81 JJ Act, 2015, at P.S. Pul Prahlad Pur, Delhi.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant is in custody since 05.05.2024 and the chargesheet has already been filed. It is further submitted that as per the prosecution case, it was the co-accused persons, *Mala* and *Neha*, who had kidnapped the child and thereafter, sold the child to the present applicant and his wife through another co-accused person, *Sunil*. He also submits that the co-accused *Neha* has already been released on bail by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 26.09.2024. Furthermore, it is submitted that the applicant is a bank employee and had no knowledge of the commission of the offence.
3. Learned APP for the State, while opposing the bail application, submits that in the present case, the incident of snatching and kidnapping of the seven-month-old child was captured in the CCTV footage, which shows



that both *Mala* and *Neha* had taken away the child at around 3:30 pm. Within two hours of the said incident, the co-accused *Sunil*, who was previously known to the present applicant, had CDR connectivity with him. Thereafter, the child was recovered at the instance of the present applicant from the house of his sister-in-law within 12 hours of commission of the alleged offence. It is also submitted that the co-accused *Neha* was released on bail considering her young age.

4. I have heard both the counsels for the parties.

5. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence and the fact that there is CDR connectivity between the present applicant and the co-accused, *Sunil* on the date of the incident, as well as the fact that the child was recovered at the instance of present applicant within 12 hours, I find no ground to grant bail to the applicant. The bail application is accordingly dismissed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

OCTOBER 16, 2024

akc