

FIR No.160/2019  
u/s 376/323/384/506/34 IPC  
PS: DBG Road  
State Vs. Vikas Kajla s/o. Ranvir Singh

10.07.2020

**ORDER ON THE APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF INTERIM  
BAIL OF APPLICANT/ACCUSED VIKAS KAJLA S/O. RANVIR SINGH.**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Sh. Vinay Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused  
who is on interim bail till 12.07.2020.

I.O. SI Priyank Rana in person.

Complainant/victim in person with counsel Mohd.

Azharuddin.

Arguments heard on the application for extension of interim  
bail on behalf of applicant/accused Vikas Kajla through Video Conferencing.

It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that the  
widow mother of applicant/accused is serious and she is admitted in the hospital  
and there is no one in the family of the applicant/accused except him as he is the  
only son of his parents and his presence is required for the treatment of his  
mother and make a request that interim bail of applicant/accused may kindly  
be extended.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently  
opposed the interim bail application on the ground that applicant/accused is  
involved in a heinous crime and make a submission that the application for  
extension of interim bail of applicant/accused may kindly be dismissed. Heard.


Complainant/victim has opposed the application for  
extension of interim bail of applicant/accused.



Having heard the submission, made by ld. counsel for applicant/accused, Ld. Counsel for Delhi Commission for Women and complainant/victim as well as the ld. Addl. PP for the State and after gone through the contents of the bail application and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this court is of the considered view that applicant/accused is on interim bail till 12.07.2020 order passed by this court and on request of Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused, in interest of justice and in compliance of the directions passed by High Power Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, interim bail of applicant/accused is hereby extended till 26.08.2020 with the same terms and conditions.

Intimation in this regard, in respect of interim bail extension by this court of applicant/accused be sent to Jail Superintendent, Delhi for necessary action and for record. Copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent, Delhi for necessary compliance.

Application is disposed off accordingly.



**(SATISH KUMAR)**  
**ASJ-2(CENTRAL),**  
**TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**  
**10.07.2020**

FIR No.714/2017  
u/s 365/376D/342/328/323 IPC  
PS: Burari

State Vs. Rajesh s/o. Late Sh. Sukhram

10.07.2020

**ORDER ON THE INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION OF  
APPLICANT/ACCUSED RAJESH S/O. LATE SH. SUKHRAM.**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Lakshmi Raina, Id. Counsel for DCW.  
Sh. Mukesh Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.  
Complainant/victim and her father are in person.

On asking by the court on the bail application, the prosecutrix as well as father of prosecutrix has submitted that they do not have any objection if the court granted the bail to the applicant/accused.

Arguments on the interim bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

It is submitted by Id. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is in JC w.e.f. 23.12.2017 and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence. It is further submitted by Id. Counsel for applicant/accused that prosecutrix has already been examined in the present case and as per the report of FSL, no DNA has been matched with the present applicant/accused and make a request that interim bail may kindly be granted to the applicant/accused.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently opposed the interim bail application on the ground that applicant/accused is in JC for a heinous crime and make a submission that the interim bail application of applicant/accused may kindly be dismissed. Heard.

Complainant/victim has submitted that she has no objection if the bail is granted to the applicant/accused.



Having heard the submission, made by ld. counsel for applicant/accused, Ld. Counsel for DCW and complainant/victim as well as the ld. Addl. PP for the State and after gone through the contents of the bail application, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this court is of the considered view that accused is in JC w.e.f. 23.12.2017 and there is outbreak of Covid-19.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as well judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SUO MOTO WRIT PETITION © No.1/2002, order/judgment dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court in Delhi in case titled as Shobha Gupta & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors Writ Petition © No.2945/2020 and vide order dtd. 07.04.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, applicant/accused is admitted to interim bail for a period of 45 days on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Supdt. The said period of 45 days shall commence from the date of his release from Jail. Accused shall surrender before the concerned Jail Supdt. on expiry of interim bail period i.e. 45 days.

Copy of order be sent to concerned Jail Supdt. forthwith for compliance.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.



**(SATISH KUMAR)**  
**ASJ-2(CENTRAL),**  
**TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**  
**10.07.2020**



FIR No.333/2019  
u/s 376/328/406/341/506 IPC  
PS: Nabi Karim  
State Vs. Ashish s/o. Sh. Murari Lal

10.07.2020

**ORDER ON THE INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION OF  
APPLICANT/ACCUSED ASHISH S/O SH. MURARI LAL.**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Lakshmi Raina, Id. Counsel for DCW.  
Sh. Rakesh Rajput, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.  
Complainant/victim in person in the court.  
Arguments on the interim bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

It is submitted by Id. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is in JC w.e.f. 25.09.2019 and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence and mother of applicant/accused is severely ill and make a request that interim bail for two months may kindly be granted to the applicant/accused.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently opposed the interim bail application on the ground that applicant/accused is in JC for a heinous crime and make a submission that the interim bail application of applicant/accused may kindly be dismissed. Heard.

Complainant/victim has opposed the interim bail application of applicant/accused.

Having heard the submission, made by Id. counsel for applicant/accused, Ld. Counsel for DCW and complainant/victim as well as the Id. Addl. PP for the State and after gone through the contents of the bail application, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this court is of the considered view that accused is in JC w.e.f. 25.09.2019 and there is outbreak of Covid-19 and mother of applicant/accused is severely ill.



Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as well judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SUO MOTO WRIT PETITION © No.1/2002, order/judgment dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court in Delhi in case titled as Shobha Gupta & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors Writ Petition © No.2945/2020 and vide order dtd. 07.04.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, applicant/accused is admitted to interim bail for a period of 45 days on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Supdt. The said period of 45 days shall commence from the date of his release from Jail. Accused shall surrender before the concerned Jail Supdt. on expiry of interim bail period i.e. 45 days.

Accused/applicant is directed not to approach in any manner to the complainant directly or indirectly. Accused is further directed not to make any call from his mobile phone to the mobile phone of the complainant or her family members during the period of interim bail.

Copy of order be sent to concerned Jail Supdt. forthwith for compliance.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

  
(SATISH KUMAR)  
ASJ-2(CENTRAL),  
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.  
10.07.2020

FIR No.157/2019  
u/s 370/376/109/353/34 IPC & 4/5/6 of ITP Act  
PS: Kamla Market  
State Vs. Mahima w/o Sh. Jalalluddin

10.07.2020

**ORDER ON THE INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION OF  
APPLICANT/ACCUSED MAHIMA W/O SH. JALALUUDIN.**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Lakshmi Raina, ld. Counsel for DCW.  
Sh. Devender Hora, ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.  
I.O. SI Mahesh Bhargav has filed his report.  
Complainant/victim is not present despite service.  
Arguments on the interim bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

It is submitted by ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is in JC w.e.f. 01.08.2019 and she has nothing to do with the alleged offence and there is no allegations made by the prosecutrix in her statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C. and make a request that interim bail for two months may kindly be granted to the applicant/accused.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently opposed the interim bail application on the ground that applicant/accused is in JC for a heinous crime and make a submission that the interim bail application of applicant/accused may kindly be dismissed. Heard.

Having heard the submission, made by ld. counsel for applicant/accused as well as the ld. Addl. PP for the State and after gone through the contents of the bail application, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this court is of the considered view that accused is in JC w.e.f. 01.08.2019 and there is outbreak of Covid-19,

As per directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in case of section 376 IPC bail application is to be disposed of in the presence of the



complainant and in compliance of the practice directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, this court has issued notice to the complainant through I.O./SHO and SHO was directed to make contact to the Senior Superintendent of Police District Tamalpur, Baksa, Assam where the complainant/victim is residing and Senior Superintendent of Police was directed to secure presence of the victim through Video Conferencing for today. As per the report filed by the I.O. SI Mahesh Bhargav PS Kamla Market who had contacted the Senior Superintendent of Police Sh. Pratik Thube from him mobile No.9910794916 to the mobile phone number 8011100011 of Senior Superintendent of Police, Assam as well as the SHO of the concerned area where the complainant/victim used to reside on the SHO phone No.9435089137 and it was told by the SHO concerned of Assam that the complainant was not available at the given address and she had gone somewhere in Guwahati and her husband is residing at the given address and also providing mobile no.9127570175 and when the I.O. make call on the mobile phone number of the husband of the complainant/victim, he has stated that they are not willing to come to Delhi to appear in this case and thereafter, he had put his mobile phone as switched off. It appears that the complainant does not want to appear in this court on notice of the bail application or even through Video Conferencing.

Ld. Counsel for DCW has also made efforts to contact through her mobile phone to the mobile phone of the complainant/victim but the same was also found switched off and it appears that despite knowledge of the bail application being filed by the Id. Counsel for applicant/accused, the complainant/victim intentionally and deliberately is not willing to join the proceedings of the bail application.

The accused was granted interim bail on 22.02.2020 by this court and she has to surrender on 22.03.2020 and in compliance of court order after availing the facility of the bail, she has surrendered before the Jail Authorities on 22.03.2020. Hon'ble Delhi High Court vide order dtd. 15.06.2020 has passed the order that :






*"In view of the lockdown in the State of Delhi and the extremely limited functioning of courts, routine matters have been adjourned en bloc to particular dates in the month of April. Thus, advocates and litigants have not been in a position to appear in the said matters, including those where stay/bails/paroles have been granted by this Court or the courts subordinate to this Court, on or before 16.03.2020. As a result, interim orders operating in favour of parties have expired or will expire on or after 16.03.2020."*

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as well judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SUO MOTO WRIT PETITION © No.1/2002, order/judgment dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court in Delhi in case titled as Shobha Gupta & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors Writ Petition © No.2945/2020 and vide order dtd. 07.04.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, applicant/accused is admitted to interim bail for a period of 45 days on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Supdt. The said period of 45 days shall commence from the date of her release from Jail. Accused shall surrender before the concerned Jail Supdt. on expiry of interim bail period i.e. 45 days.

Accused/applicant is directed not to approach in any manner to the complainant directly or indirectly. Accused is further directed not to make any call from her mobile phone to the mobile phone of the complainant or her family members during the period of interim bail.

Copy of order be sent to concerned Jail Supdt. forthwith for compliance. Application stands disposed of accordingly.

  
(SATISH KUMAR)  
ASJ-2(CENTRAL),  
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.  
10.07.2020

FIR No.89/2020  
u/s 376D/354/509 IPC  
PS: Nabi Karim

State Vs. Sandeep Kumar s/o. Sh. Rajendra Shahi

10.07.2020

**ORDER ON THE ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION OF  
APPLICANT/ACCUSED SANDEEP KUMAR S/O. SH. RAJENDRA SHAHI.**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Lakshmi Raina, ld. Counsel for DCW.  
Sh. Vikas Arora, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.  
Sh. Akhil Goyal, ld. Counsel for complainant/victim.  
I.O. SI Sushil Sanwaria in person.

Complainant/victim heard through Whatsapp Video Call on the mobile phone No. 9210478590 of I.O.

Arguments on the Anticipatory bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

It is submitted by ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused has nothing to do with the alleged offence and he has been falsely implicated just to settle the personal score. ld. Counsel for applicant/accused has submitted that he had joined the investigation with the I.O. and has personally visited in the DCP Office and has shown the CCTV footage of the date of alleged offence and make a submission that Anticipatory Bail may kindly be granted.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently opposed the Anticipatory bail application on the ground that there are serious allegations against the applicant/accused and make a submission that the Anticipatory bail application of applicant/accused may kindly be dismissed. Heard.

Having heard the submission, made by ld. counsel for applicant/accused, Ld. Counsel for DCW, Ld. Counsel for complainant as well



as the Id. Addl. PP for the State and after gone through the contents of the bail application, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this court is of the considered view that no custodial interrogation is required. Applicant/accused is directed to join the investigation as and when required by the I.O./SHO.

Be put up for **24.08.2020** for further arguments on Anticipatory bail application. Till then no coercive action shall be taken against the applicant/accused by IO/SHO in aforesaid case FIR.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the I.O.



**(SATISH KUMAR)**  
**ASJ-2(CENTRAL),**  
**TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**  
**10.07.2020**

**FIR No.160/2019**  
**u/s 376/323/384/506/34 IPC**  
**PS: DBG Road**  
**State Vs. Vikas Kajla**

**10.07.2020**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Complainant/victim with counsel Sh. Mohd. Azharduddin,  
ld. Counsel for applicant/complainant.

Sh. Vinay Kumar Sharma, ld. Counsel for accused.

Arguments on application for cancellation of bail of accused  
Vikas Kajla heard through Video conferencing.

It is submitted by ld. Counsel for complainant that accused  
Vikas Kajla has been released on interim bail of 45 days vide order dtd.  
29.05.2020 and after his release complainant/applicant continuously receiving  
threats from various person and from various numbers.

It is further submitted by ld. Counsel for complainant that on  
dtd. 01.06.2020 when the applicant/complainant went outside of her home to  
purchase some household articles then four boys stopped the complainant by  
her name, on which complainant asked them that who are they and how they  
know her name, on which they start threatening and said "tu hi nandini hai,  
jisne hamare bhai vikas kajla ko jail me band karwaya hai! Lekin ab hamara  
bhai vikas kajla jail se aa gya hai, ab tujhe ham jaan se mareng or tere maa-  
baap ko b jaan se maar kar jayenge". On which complainant run away from  
there and some how reached to her home.

It is further submitted by ld. Counsel for  
applicant/complainant that accused person indirectly tried to threaten the  
applicant/accused after his release. It is further submitted by ld. Counsel for  
applicant/complainant that applicant/complainant also moved various






complainant before SHO PS DBG Road and DCP Central Delhi and requested for her protection but no heed pay the police officials on the request of applicant/complainant. Copy of complaints dated 08.06.2020 are annexed herewith. On these grounds, ld. Counsel for applicant/complainant has made a request that bail of accused Vikas Kajla may kindly be cancelled.

Part arguments on the application for cancellation of bail of accused Vikas Kajla heard. Let, notice of this application be served upon the Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Be put up for filing the reply on behalf of Ld. Counsel for accused and for further arguments on application for cancellation of bail of accused Vikas Kajla on **26.08.2020**.

  
**(SATISH KUMAR)**  
**ASJ-2(CENTRAL),**  
**TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**  
**10.07.2020**

FIR No.117/2018  
u/s 376/506 IPC  
PS: Maurice Nagar  
State Vs. Sarabjeet Singh @ Lucky @ Avneet Singh s/o. Sh.  
Gurcharan Singh

10.07.2020

**ORDER ON THE INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION OF APPLICANT/  
ACCUSED SARABJEET SINGH @ LUCKY @ AVNEET SINGH S/O. SH.  
GURCHARAN SINGH.**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Lakshmi Raina, Ld. Counsel for DCW.  
Sh. S.N. Shukla, Ld. Legal Aid Counsel for applicant/accused.  
Complainant/victim heard through Video Conferencing.  
I.O. W/SI Saris Khan has filed reply to the bail application.  
Arguments on the interim bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

It is submitted by ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is in JC w.e.f. 17.09.2018 and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence. It is further submitted by ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that prosecutrix has already been examined in the present case and father of applicant/accused namely Sh. Gurcharan Singh is suffering from heavy pain in his both knee and the Orthopaedic doctor of the Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital and Dr. Jagjit Singh of Deep Ortho Clinic had suggested for knee replacement of the father of the applicant/accused. It is further submitted by ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that the knee replacement of the father of the applicant/accused is an emergency and the mother of the applicant/accused is also a senior citizen and there is no one in his family to take after the father of the applicant/accused at the time of his knee replacement and make a request that interim bail for 45 days may kindly be granted to the applicant/accused.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently opposed the interim bail application on the ground that applicant/accused is in JC for a heinous crime and the applicant/accused has moved an application for interim bail before this

✓


court before the lockdown for Covid19 Pandemic and the said application of the interim bail on the medical ground of the parents of the applicant/accused was dismissed by this court and if this court grant any interim bail to the applicant/accused then he may misuse for the same and and make a submission that the interim bail application of applicant/accused may kindly be dismissed. Heard.

Complainant/victim has stated that interim bail may not be granted to the applicant/accused.

Having heard the submission, made by ld. counsel for applicant/accused, Ld. Counsel for DCW and complainant/victim as well as the ld. Addl. PP for the State and after gone through the contents of the bail application as well as case file and without commenting upon the merits of the cases, this court is of the considered view that applicant/accused is in JC w.e.f. 17.09.2018 and the allegations against the accused are of very serious nature and there is possibility that he may misuse the liberty of interim bail and all the witnesses have already been examined and even the statement of accused u/s 313 Cr.P.C. has already been recorded and the case is at the stage of final arguments.

Further, the I.O. has submitted that during the verification of the medical document submitted by the applicant/accused, it was stated by the concerned Dr. Jagjit Singh that "at the same time it is stated that this is not emergency surgery and can be deferred for few months." Therefore, in these facts and circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused. Hence, the interim bail application of applicant/accused is hereby dismissed.

Interim Bail application is disposed off accordingly.

  
**(SATISH KUMAR)**  
**ASJ-2(CENTRAL),**  
**TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**  
**10.07.2020**

FIR No.90/2019  
u/s 376D/354D/506/328/34 IPC  
PS: I.P. Estate  
State Vs. Raj Kumar s/o. Sh. Jabbar Singh

10.07.2020

**ORDER ON THE BAIL APPLICATION OF APPLICANT/ACCUSED  
RAJ KUMAR S/O. SH. JABBAR SINGH.**

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Lakshmi Raina, Ld. Counsel for DCW.  
Ms. Daljeet Kaur, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Raj  
Kumar s/o. Sh. Jabbar Singh.

Complainant/victim heard through Video Conferencing.  
Arguments on the bail application heard through Video  
Conferencing.

It is submitted by ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is in JC w.e.f. 08.05.2019 and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence. It is further submitted by ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused and prosecutrix were known to each other and having in love relation with each other since long and make a request that bail may kindly be granted to the applicant/accused.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that applicant/accused is in JC for a heinous crime and examination of prosecutrix is yet to be completed and make a submission that the bail application of applicant/accused may kindly be dismissed. Heard.

Complainant/victim has stated that bail may not be granted to the applicant/accused.

4



Having heard the submission, made by Id. counsel for applicant/accused, Ld. Counsel for Delhi Commission for Women, complainant/victim as well as the Id. Addl. PP for the State and after gone through the contents of the bail application as well as case file and without commenting upon the merits of the cases, this court is of the considered view that applicant/accused is in JC w.e.f. 08.05.2019 and the allegations against the accused are of very serious nature and examination of prosecutrix is yet to be completed and there is every apprehension, if this court grants the bail to the applicant/accused then the accused may cause injury to the complainant/victim. Therefore, in these facts and circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused. Hence, the bail application of applicant/accused is hereby dismissed.

Bail application is disposed off accordingly.

  
**(SATISH KUMAR)**  
**ASJ-2(CENTRAL),**  
**TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**  
**10.07.2020**