

SC No. 687/2018
STATE Vs. VINEET VERMA ETC

FIR No. 429/2018
PS-Mehrauli

05.01.2019

Present :- Mr. F.M. Ansari, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Accused Vineet Verma produced from JC.

Accused Amit in person on bail.

Mr. Vinod Kumar, Ld. Counsel for accused Vineet Verma.

Mr. Vinod Sharma, Ahlmad to the Court of Ld. MM-05 has submitted his reply in pursuance of order dated 24.12.2018 and he has also placed on record the orders, bail application, reply and vakalatnama which were not attached by him to the case file while committing the case to the Court of Sessions. The documents are taken on record.

Argument on the bail application of the accused Vineet Verma heard. Accused Amit @ Sonu states that his counsel is not available today due to some personal difficulty. Vide separate order the accused Vineet Verma is admitted to bail subject to furnishing personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety in the like amount.

List the matter on **31.01.2019** for argument on charge.

(Rajesh Kumar Singh)
Special Judge-NDPS/ASJ(South)
Saket Courts/05.01.2019

SC No. 687/2018
STATE Vs. VINEET VERMA ETC

FIR No. 429/2018
PS-Mehrauli

05.01.2019

Bail Order of the accused Vineet Verma.

1. By this order I shall dispose of the bail application of the accused Vineet Verma dt. 20.12.2018. Ld. Counsel for the accused has argued that the story of the police as narrated in the charge sheet is not believable. Ld. Counsel has pointed out that the accused did not suffer any injury though according to the police he and the co-accused fell down from the motorcycle after being hit by the police officers riding on the other motorcycle. Ld. Counsel has pointed out other facts from the FIR, which according to him do not appeal to reason. Ld. Counsel also submits that co-accused Amit @ Sonu was granted bail by the Court of Ld. ASJ-02 (South) vide order 28.11.2018. The accused/applicant Vineet Verma is in JC for about six months. Investigation is complete. Additionally, it is stated that while the accused was in JC, his wife delivered a child. The accused has not been able to meet his wife and child. The delivery was done under complicated medical conditions and presence of the accused is required to take care of his family.

2. Ld. Addl. PP has opposed the bail application. It is submitted that the correctness of the allegations made in the FIR cannot be judged at this stage. The accused was apprehended from the spot. Weapon was recovered from him. On his disclosure the co-accused was identified. The co-

SC No. 687/2018
STATE Vs. VINEET VERMA ETC
05.01.2019 (Bail Order of the accused Vineet Verma)

-2-

accused surrendered in the Court and weapon was recovered at his instance also when he was taken on PC. Ld. Addl. PP has also pointed out towards previous involvement of the accused, which includes cases of similar nature and of robbery/dacoity. It is also submitted by Ld. Addl. PP that there is no document to show that medical condition of the wife of the accused is not good.

3. I have considered the arguments and I have perused the record. The previous cases against the accused are of the year 2010 and 2015. Apparently there was no involvement after 2015. Co-accused whose role in the present incident was similar to the accused has already been granted bail. The observations made by the Ld. Court while granting bail to the co-accused apply to the accused Vineet Verma also. Accordingly, the application is allowed. The accused Vineet Verma is admitted to bail subject to furnishing personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety of like amount. While on bail he should not indulge in any criminal activity. Copy of the order be sent to jail concerned for information. Copy of order be given to the Ld. Counsel for accused.

(Rajesh Kumar Singh)
Special Judge-NDPS/ASJ(South)
Saket Courts/05.01.2019