



\$~5

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

BAIL APPLN. 395/2025

VIJAY ALIAS VINOD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. B.S. Yadav, Adv.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh,
APP for the State.

SI Pinki, PS Sultanpuri,
Ms. Arpita Srivastava &
Ms. Rakhi Dubey, Advs.
for victim along with
victim and her mother in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

01.05.2025

1. The learned counsel for the applicant, at the outset, submits that since all the public witnesses have been examined and only 10 formal witnesses are remaining to be examined, he is hopeful that recording of the evidence would conclude within a period of 6 to 10 months.
2. He seeks liberty to withdraw the present application and take all arguments before the learned Trial Court and file an application afresh if the trial is unduly delayed.
3. In view of the above, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.
4. Section 35(2) of the POCSO Act mandates trial for offence under POCSO Act to be concluded in a time bound manner. The learned Trial Court is, therefore, expected to conclude the recording of the evidence expeditiously.



5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State also assures that formal witnesses would be produced on the date fixed before the learned Trial Court and no unwarranted adjournment would be taken.

6. This Court also appreciates the effort put in by the learned *Amicus* Ms. Arpita Srivastava, who represented the victim on the request of the Court.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 1, 2025

“SK”