



\$~69

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 2385/2025**
PRABAKARANPetitioner

Through: Mr. Samaksh Sharma, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE OF (NCT OF DELHI)Respondent
Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP.
SI Ravi Beniwal, P.S. Lajpat Nagar.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
26.08.2025

%

1. Mr. Samaksh Sharma, counsel for Petitioner, states that since the Petitioner has already been enlarged on bail by the Sessions Court, he has instructions to withdraw the present application.
2. Noticing that the bail has been granted by the Sessions Court during the pendency of the instant bail application, the Court has queried whether such a fact has to be brought to the notice of the Sessions Court by the Petitioner. In response, Mr. Sharma states that the application for bail was moved by the Petitioner through another counsel and he did not represent the Petitioner before the Sessions Court.
3. Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for State, submits that this fact could not be brought to the notice of the Sessions Court by the State.
4. Since the State itself has not brought this fact to the notice of the Sessions Court, perhaps the error has occurred. The State is directed to be



remained vigilant so that this lapse does not occur in the future.

5. With the above directions and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 26, 2025

as