

\$~3.

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

+ CRL.A. 101/2019

VISHAL @ BUNTI Appellant

Through: Mr. Hemant Singh, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (GNCT) OF DELHI Respondent

Through: Mr. Ravi Nayak, APP for the State
with SI Pushpender PS Ambedkar
Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNISH BHATNAGAR

ORDER

17.06.2020

%

CRL.M.(BAIL) 6434/2020

1. State has filed its status report. Latest nominal roll has also been called for and the same is on record.
2. We have perused the status report and the nominal roll.
3. The status report discloses that Chetna, the lady whom the appellant claims to be his fiancé, is living separately from her parents. She stated that she wishes to marry the appellant. The parents of Chetna have also stated to the same effect.
4. The submission of the learned counsel for the appellant is that the appellant may be granted one day's interim bail in police custody so that he could marry Chetna and leave her to his parental home.
5. We are not inclined to accept this submission of the appellant for the

reason that the nominal roll discloses, firstly, that the appellant has undergone 6 years, 10 months and 10 days incarceration as on 12.06.2020. Secondly, the appellant is involved in four other serious and heinous cases, being FIR No. 8/2016 under Sections 302/34 IPC registered at Police Station Hauz Khas,; FIR No. 538/2015 under Sections 186/353/332/147/149 IPC registered at Police Station Hari Nagar; FIR No. 302/2018 under Sections 307/34 IPC and 25/27 Arms Act registered at Police Station Ambedkar Nagar and; FIR No. 747/2014 under Sections 324/34 IPC registered at Police Station Saket.

6. Pertinently, all these involvements are after the registration of the FIR in question wherein the appellant stands convicted under Section 302 IPC in case FIR No. 271/2013 registered at Police Station Ambedkar Nagar. Even the jail conduct of the appellant was found to be unsatisfactory between 2014 and 2016. No doubt, his jail conduct after 2016 has not been reported to be unsatisfactory. However, looking to the propensities of the appellant's involvement in serious and heinous crimes, we are not inclined to grant interim bail to the appellant at this stage.

7. Dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

RAJNISH BHATNAGAR, J

JUNE 17, 2020

AK