



\$~11

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 3996/2024**
WASIMPetitioner
Through: Mr Rajbir Singh Sagar, Advocate

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI)Respondent
Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for State with
SI Sumeet

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER
02.12.2024

%

1. By way of present application, the petitioner/applicant seeks regular bail in FIR No.112/2023 registered under Sections 392/394/411/201/454/120B IPC at P.S. Vivek Vihar, Delhi.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been in custody since 21.03.2023 and seeks parity with the co-accused, who has already been released on regular bail. He submits that the applicant is not involved in any other case. Lastly, it is submitted that all the witnesses have been examined and the applicant be released on bail.
3. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the present bail application. He submits that the applicant's earlier bail application was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 09.09.2024 passed in BAIL APPLN. 3255/2024. While disputing the ground of parity, he submits that the bail application of the co-accused was considered as the role assigned to the said accused was limited to hiring the present applicant, who indeed committed the offence. Further, an amount of Rs.3 lakhs and jewelry items



were also recovered from the present applicant. Lastly, it is submitted that the statements of the complainant (PW-1) and her mother were recorded by the Trial Court and they have supported the case of the prosecution.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State and have also gone through the material placed on record.

5. Considering the role assigned to the co-accused and the present applicant, the contention seeking parity is misplaced inasmuch as it is the present applicant who tied up the minor child and also slapped & beat her. The chargesheet is also accompanied by MLC to this effect. The prosecution has also examined the complainant as well as her mother as PW-1 and PW-2 and both the witnesses have supported the prosecution's case.

6. For the aforementioned reasons, I find no ground to entertain the present application. Accordingly, the same stands dismissed.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

DECEMBER 2, 2024

na