



\$~6

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 570/2025**

DINESH DIXIT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aakash Godara, Advocate.

versus

STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Aman Usman, APP for the State
with Inspector C.L. Meena,
Rashtrapati Bhawan,. Inspector
Ramesh, PS Dwarka
Dr. N.C.Sharma, Adv. for the
complainant with complainant in
person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

27.03.2025

%

1. This is an application for grant of regular bail filed on behalf of the petitioner Dinesh Dixit in case FIR No. 228/2019, South-West District, Dwarka, under Section 302/392/411/420/468/471/201 IPC.
2. Mr. Aakash Godara, Advocate for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 29.04.2019 and that out of 48 witnesses, cited by the prosecution, only 3 have so far been examined. Therefore, it may not be possible to conclude the trial within a short period. It is further submitted that main public witnesses have already been examined and most of the witnesses to be examined are only the officials of the police and thus there is no possibility of threatening or intimidating the witnesses.



3. Bail application has been vehemently opposed by the learned Additional PP, submitting that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. It is stated that petitioner was granted interim bail in July 2020, which was later on extended due to Corona outbreak and while being on interim bail, he got involved in four more criminal cases, including two cases under Section 307 IPC. It is further submitted that there are 9 public witnesses and out of them, only 3 have been examined so far, and thus, there is a possibility that on being released on bail, the petitioner may threaten or try to win over the witnesses.

4. As per prosecution story, petitioner knew the victim Meenu Jain. In order to rob her, on 25.04.2019, he came at her house at Sector-7, Dwarka, where, they both took drink. He mixed sleeping pills, due to which, victim became unconscious. After that, he took all the jewellery and Indian and foreign currency and while he was about to leave the room, victim woke up and tried to stop him, whereupon, the petitioner killed her by smothering with a pillow.

5. During investigation, the robbed jewellery, Rs. 2 lakh Indian currency and foreign currency are shown to have been recovered at the instance of the petitioner. The car in which the petitioner had visited the society of the victim, has also been recovered at the instance of the present petitioner. The investigation has also revealed that petitioner had changed the number plate of the car with the help of a mechanic Haneef. The original number plate was later recovered from said Haneef. Accused is visible in the CCTV footage of the society on the date of occurrence with fake number plate on his car. The CDR of petitioner also shows his location at the time of incident to be that of Dwarka.



6. Petitioner has criminal antecedents. The nominal roll of the petitioner received from the jail shows his involvement in five more cases. While being on interim bail, petitioner got involved in four more cases.

7. Considering the totality of facts and circumstances, quality of evidence, nature and gravity of allegations and the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, in my view, this is not a fit case for grant of bail to the petitioner at this stage.

8. The application is dismissed.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.

MARCH 27, 2025

RM