



\$~15

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.A. 516/2020**

NEELU

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Dinesh Malik, Mr. Puneet Jain
and Mr. Lavish Arora, Advocates.

versus

STATE

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Shubhi Gupta, APP for State with
SI Harsh Kumar, P.S. Nabi Karim.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

% **24.09.2025**

CRL.M.(BAIL) 966/2025

1. The present application has been filed by the appellant seeking suspension of sentence during the pendency of the appeal.
2. By way of present appeal, the appellant seeks to assail the judgement of conviction 28.03.2019 vide which he was convicted for the offence punishable under Section 326A/341 IPC. Vide order on sentence dated 12.03.2020 appellant has been directed to undergo RI for a period of 20 years with payment of fine of Rs.10 lakhs out of which Rs.8 lakhs to be paid to victim *Sukhdev* and a balance Rs.2 lakhs shall be paid to victim *Vipin Goswami* and in default of payment of fine to further undergo RI for 1 year for the offence under Section 326A and further sentenced to fine of Rs.500/- and in default of payment of fine to further undergo SI for 3 days for offence under section 341 IPC. All the sentences have been directed to run concurrently.



3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that as per the prosecution case, the incident occurred when the appellant and the victim/*Sukhdev* were quarrelling with each other and an altercation took place. He further submits that while it is alleged that the appellant has caused permanent damage to the eyes and face of the victim by throwing acid on them and the injuries caused to the victim/*Vipin Goswami* is opined to be simple and the injuries caused to the victim/*Sukhdev* is opined to be grievous, however, the MLC does not record the extent of burn. Even the impugned judgment is silent on the aspect of the extent of injuries. He further submits that the appellant has undergone the sentence of more than 12 years out of the total sentence of 20 years and has been in continuous incarceration since 10.05.2015. Lastly, it is submitted that the appellant has already undergone more than the minimum sentence that can be imposed under Section 326A IPC.

4. The application is opposed by the Ld. APP who contends that the concerned doctor, who has examined the victims, opined that the injuries of *Sukhdev* were grievous being opacity over the left cornea.

5. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties and perused the records available on record.

6. Nominal Roll dated 01.09.2025 of the appellant is on record as per which, he has undergone 10 years, 3 months and 9 days with period of remission of 1 year, 10 months and 10 day as on 30.08.2025 and his overall jail conduct is satisfactory. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances and the nominal roll, the sentence of the appellant is directed to be suspended during the pendency of appeal on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Judicial Magistrate/Link



Judicial Magistrate/Jail Superintendent and also subject to the further following conditions:-

- (i) The appellant shall provide his mobile number to the Investigating Officer on which he shall remain available during the pendency of the present appeal.
- (ii) In case of change of residential address or contact details, the appellant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Investigating Officer as well as to this Court.
- (iii) The appellant shall regularly appear before the Court as and when the appeal is taken up for hearing.

7. With the above directions, the application is disposed of.

8. A copy of this order be communicated electronically forthwith to the concerned Jail Superintendent for information and necessary compliance.

CRL.M.(BAIL) 1866/2025

In view of the order passed in CRL.M.(BAIL) 966/2025, the present application has become infructuous and the same is disposed of accordingly.

CRL.A. 516/2020

1. List for hearing on 12.12.2025. The date already fixed, i.e. 29.10.2025, stands cancelled.

2. At this stage, Ld. APP for the State has drawn attention to the portion of the order on sentence where it has been stated that the victim was referred to the Central District Legal Services Authority for compensation under Section 357B Cr.P.C. The IO/SHO shall inform the victim about the existence of the Avlamban Fund Scheme 2024, where acid attack victims are entitled to seek additional compensation.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

SEPTEMBER 24, 2025/ga