

State vs. Ravinder @ Sardare
FIR No. 162/2020
Under Section 307/452/34 IPC
PS Subzi Mandi

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Rishabh Jain, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.
Sh. Abid Ahmed, Ld. Counsel for complainant.
IO is absent.

Heard. Perused.

Report has been received from IO through email.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that co-accused namely Rajesh has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 19.06.2020 and hence, accused/applicant is entitled to bail on the ground of parity.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State argued that accused/applicant is a habitual offender and is a BC of area. It is further submitted that bail was granted to accused Rajesh as on 19.06.2020, complainant/victim namely Naresh was present in Court and stated that he has settled the matter with accused Rajesh. It is further submitted that apart from Naresh, there is one more victim in the present case and he has not settled the matter with the accused persons. It is further submitted that offence in question is non-compoundable one.

I have duly considered the rival submissions. I have perused the record carefully and more particularly order dated 19.06.2020 passed by

Contd.....

dl
23/6/2020

State Vs. Ravinder @ Sardare
FIR No. 162/2020
Under Section 307/452/34 IPC
PS Subzi Mandi


this court on the bail application of accused/applicant i.e. Rajesh.

Perusal of order dated 19.06.2020 clearly shows that on 19.06.2020, complainant/victim namely Naresh was present in Court and has stated that he has no objection if bail is granted to accused Rajesh as matter has been amicably settled between them. Today, complainant/victim i.e. Naresh is not present. On being asked, Ld. Counsel for complainant/victim submits that he is not aware of whereabouts of Naresh. Perusal of record shows that apart from Naresh, his brother namely Dal Chand had also received injuries in the incident in question.

Allegations against accused/applicant are of serious nature. Investigation of the case is at initial stages and even charge-sheet has not been filed. Today, neither complainant/victim i.e. Naresh nor his brother i.e. Dal Chand (injured) have appeared in court. The offence in question is non-compoundable one. Tempering with the evidence/witnesses cannot be ruled out at this stage.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I find no merits in the present application. The same is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

120

State Vs. Vijay
FIR no. 162/2020
Under Section 307/452/34 IPC
PS Subzi Mandi

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Rishabh Jain, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.
Sh. Abid Ahmed, Ld. Counsel for complainant.
IO is absent.

Heard. Perused.

Report has been received from IO through email.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that co-accused namely Rajesh has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 19.06.2020 and hence, accused/applicant is entitled to bail on the ground of parity.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State argued that accused/applicant is a habitual offender and is a BC of area. It is further submitted that bail was granted to accused Rajesh as on 19.06.2020, complainant/victim namely Naresh was present in Court and stated that he has settled the matter with accused Rajesh. It is further submitted that apart from Naresh, there is one more victim in the present case and he has not settled the matter with the accused persons. It is further submitted that offence in question is non-compoundable one.

I have duly considered the rival submissions. I have perused the record carefully and more particularly order dated 19.06.2020 passed by

Contd.....

dl
23/6/2020

-2-

State Vs. Vijay
FIR No. 162/2020
Under Section 307/452/34 IPC
PS Subzi Mandi


this court on the bail application of accused/applicant i.e. Rajesh.

Perusal of order dated 19.06.2020 clearly shows that on 19.06.2020, complainant/victim namely Naresh was present in Court and has stated that he has no objection if bail is granted to accused Rajesh as matter has been amicably settled between them. Today, complainant/victim i.e. Naresh is not present. On being asked, Ld. Counsel for complainant/victim submits that he is not aware of whereabouts of Naresh. Perusal of record shows that apart from Naresh, his brother namely Dal Chand had also received injuries in the incident in question.

Allegations against accused/applicant are of serious nature. Investigation of the case is at initial stages and even charge-sheet has not been filed. Today, neither complainant/victim i.e. Naresh nor his brother i.e. Dal Chand (injured) have appeared in court. The offence in question is non-compoundable one. Tempering with the evidence/witnesses cannot be ruled out at this stage.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I find no merits in the present application. The same is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

State Vs. Ravi
FIR No. 162/2020
Under Section 307/452/34 IPC
PS Subzi Mandi

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Rishabh Jain, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.
Sh. Abid Ahmed, Ld. Counsel for complainant.
IO is absent.

Heard. Perused.

Report has been received from IO through email.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that co-accused namely Rajesh has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 19.06.2020 and hence, accused/applicant is entitled to bail on the ground of parity.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State argued that accused/applicant is a habitual offender and is a BC of area. It is further submitted that bail was granted to accused Rajesh as on 19.06.2020, complainant/victim namely Naresh was present in Court and stated that he has settled the matter with accused Rajesh. It is further submitted that apart from Naresh, there is one more victim in the present case and he has not settled the matter with the accused persons. It is further submitted that offence in question is non-compoundable one.

I have duly considered the rival submissions. I have perused the record carefully and more particularly order dated 19.06.2020 passed by

Contd.....

DL
23/6/2020

-2-

State Vs. Ravi
FIR No. 162/2020
Under Section 307/452/34 IPC
PS Subzi Mandi


this court on the bail application of accused/applicant i.e. Rajesh.

Perusal of order dated 19.06.2020 clearly shows that on 19.06.2020, complainant/victim namely Naresh was present in Court and has stated that he has no objection if bail is granted to accused Rajesh as matter has been amicably settled between them. Today, complainant/victim i.e. Naresh is not present. On being asked, Ld. Counsel for complainant/victim submits that he is not aware of whereabouts of Naresh. Perusal of record shows that apart from Naresh, his brother namely Dal Chand had also received injuries in the incident in question.

Allegations against accused/applicant are of serious nature. Investigation of the case is at initial stages and even charge-sheet has not been filed. Today, neither complainant/victim i.e. Naresh nor his brother i.e. Dal Chand (injured) have appeared in court. The offence in question is non-compoundable one. Tempering with the evidence/witnesses cannot be ruled out at this stage.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I find no merits in the present application. The same is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

State Vs. Anand Kumar @ Sudhir
FIR No. 103/2020
under Section 308/34 IPC
PS Gulabi Bagh

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
SI Ram Chander Nehra i.e. IO with file.
Sh. Jitender Kumar Tomar, Ld. Counsel for
complainant/victims alongwith Victim Rohit and Rahul.
Sh. K. K. Singh, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant
(through V/C).

Heard. Perused.

Present application has been filed on behalf of accused/applicant
named above for grant of anticipatory bail.

Sh. Jitender Kumar Tomar submits that matter has been
compromised/settled between parties and the complainant/victims have no
objection if bail is granted to accused/applicant.


On the other hand, IO has submitted that weapon used in
commission of the offence is to be recovered from the possession/at the instance
of accused/applicant.

In view of aforesaid facts and circumstances, **accused/applicant is
directed to join the investigation as and when called by the IO to do so.**

Now to come up on **29.06.2020** for disposal of application in hand.

**Till then, no coercive action shall be taken against
accused/applicant by the IO.**

Copy of order be given dasti to all the parties.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

State Vs. Sourabh
FIR No. 103/2020
under Section 308/34 IPC
PS Gulabi Bagh

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
SI Ram Chander Nehra i.e. IO with file.
Sh. Jitender Kumar Tomar, Ld. Counsel for
complainant/victims alongwith Victim Rohit and Rahul.
Sh. K. K. Singh, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant
(through V/C).

Heard. Perused.

Present application has been filed on behalf of accused/applicant
named above for grant of anticipatory bail.

Sh. Jitender Kumar Tomar submits that matter has been
compromised/settled between parties and the complainant/victims have no
objection if bail is granted to accused/applicant.


On the other hand, IO has submitted that weapon used in
commission of the offence is to be recovered from the possession/at the instance
of accused/applicant.

In view of aforesaid facts and circumstances, **accused/applicant is
directed to join the investigation as and when called by the IO to do so.**

Now to come up on **29.06.2020** for disposal of application in hand.

**Till then, no coercive action shall be taken against
accused/applicant by the IO.**

Copy of order be given dasti to all the parties.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020


State Vs. Sadiq Qamar
FIR No.: Not known
under Section: Not known
PS Timarpur

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Ms Akanksha Mishra, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant
(through V/C).

Heard. Perused.

Issue notice to complainant through SHO PS Timarpur for
25.06.2020.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

State Vs. Mohd Israil
FIR No. 87/2015
under Section 20/29 NDPS Act
PS Crime Branch

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. S. Haq, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant i.e. Mohd
Israil.


Heard. Perused.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that application
in hand has been filed on behalf of accused/applicant named above for
grant of interim bail on the basis of guidelines issued by Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi qua COVID-19/CORONA.

Perusal of guidelines dated 18.05.2020 issued by High
Powered Committee clearly shows that the cases pertaining to
recovery of commercial quantity of Narcotic Drugs/Psychotropic
Substances are not to be considered for grant of interim bail.

In the present case, 21 kg 'Ganja' was allegedly recovered
from the possession of accused/applicant. The said quantity is
commercial quantity.

In view of aforesaid facts and circumstances, I find no
merits in the present application. The same is hereby dismissed and
disposed of accordingly.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

State Vs. Bali Khan & Anr.
FIR No. 54/2020
under Section 20/29 NDPS Act
PS Crime Branch

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Kamal J S Maan, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.
SI Arvind Kumar is also present for IO.

Heard. Perused.


Application in hand has been filed on behalf of
accused/applicant namely Bali Khan for extension of interim bail for a
period of one month.

SI Arvind Kumar has filed written request seeking some
more time for verification of medical papers filed alongwith present
application.

Time is granted.

Now to come up on **25.06.2020** for disposal of application
in hand.

Report shall be filed on NDOH positively.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

Cr Rev No. 02/2020
Manoj Kumar Vs. State
FIR No. 201/2018
under Section 419/420/467/468/471/120-B IPC
PS EOW

23.06.2020

Criminal Revision Petition received by way of assignment. It be checked and registered.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for
accused/petitioner (through V/C).


Heard. Perused.

TCR be summoned from the Court of Ld. CMM, Central
District, Delhi for NDOH just three days before NDOH.

It is clarified that there is no stay on further proceedings
before the court of Ld. CMM and Ld. CMM is at liberty to frame charge
against accused/applicant on 01.07.2020 in terms of order dated
01.06.2020.

Copy of present order-sheet be sent to the Court of Ld. CMM,
Central District forthwith.

Now to come up on 15.07.2020 for arguments and disposal of
present petition.


23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

State Vs. Suraj @ Charang
FIR No. 311/2019
under Section 20 and 29 NDPS Act
PS Crime Branch

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Sumit Sharma, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.
SI Arvind Kumar is also present for IO.

Heard. Perused.

Present application has been filed on behalf of accused/applicant named above for grant of interim bail for a period of two months on the ground that grandfather of accused/applicant is seriously ill.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that grandfather of accused/applicant is virtually on death bed. Grandfather of accused/applicant wants that accused/applicant should serve him in his last days. It is further submitted that father of accused/applicant is not taking any care of his father i.e. grandfather of accused/applicant. It is further submitted that accused/applicant is not aware about the whereabouts of his father. It is further submitted that grandfather of accused/applicant is in hospital w.e.f. 15.06.2020 till date. It is further submitted that there is no other responsible male member in the family of accused/applicant to look after his grandfather.

On the other hand, SI Arvind Kumar submits that father of accused/applicant is also wanted in this case and he is deliberately evading process of law. It is further submitted that process under Section 82/83 Cr.P.C. has already been issued against father of accused/applicant. It is

Contd.....

dl
23/6/2020

State Vs. Suraj @ Charang
FIR No. 311/2019
under Section 20 and 29 NDPS Act
PS Crime Branch

further submitted that uncle of accused/applicant is very much there to take care of his ailing father i.e. grandfather of accused/applicant.

In rebuttal, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that uncle of accused/applicant is held up in Nepal and is not in India.

I have duly considered the rival submissions. I have perused the record carefully.

As per prosecution case, 10 kg 'Charas' (commercial quantity) was allegedly recovered from the possession of accused/applicant. Perusal of medical documents annexed with application in hand shows that grandfather of accused/applicant is suffering from TB as well as Hepatitis. In the medical documents, it is nowhere mentioned that the said diseases are life threatening qua grandfather of accused/applicant. Even otherwise, the mere fact that grandfather of accused/applicant is suffering from some serious disease *ipso facto* does not entitle accused/applicant for interim bail, keeping in view the seriousness of allegations against him.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I find no merits in the present application. The same is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Copy received
Sumit
Phanua
23/6/2020

dl
23/6/2020
(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020

State Vs. Ricky @ Budhram
FIR No. 272/2015
under Section 302/34 IPC
PS Nabi Karim

23.06.2020.

Present: Sh. Ghanshyam Srivastava, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, proxy Counsel for accused/applicant.

Heard. Perused.


Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that application in hand has been filed on behalf of accused/applicant named above for grant of regular bail. It is further submitted that accused/applicant is in JC since 30.05.2015. It is further submitted that all the material witnesses have already been examined and conclusion of trial is likely to take time. It is further submitted that accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in this case.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State submits that the application in hand is without merits and the same is liable to be dismissed. It is further submitted that allegations against accused/applicant are of very serious nature. Accused/applicant is a habitual offender and previously also he was involved in as many as 18 cases and is also a previous convict in 04 cases.

I have duly considered the rival submissions. I have perused the record carefully.

Perusal of record shows that allegations against

Contd.....


23/6/2020

-2-

State Vs. Ricky @ Budhram
FIR No. 272/2015
under Section 302/34 IPC
PS Nabi Karim

accused/applicant are of very serious nature. Accused/applicant is a habitual offender and is also a previous convict. Possibility of tempering with the evidence/witnesses and fleeing away from the process of law cannot be ruled out. Even possibility of repeating similar offences cannot be ruled out keeping in view the previous conduct of accused/applicant.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I find no merits in the present application. The same is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

dl
23/6/2020

(Deepak Dabas)
ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS
(Central) Tis Hazari Courts
Delhi/23.06.2020