FIR No. 63/2020

Under Section: 354/376/506 IPC

Police Station : Ranhola State vs Sohan Sharma

14.09.2020

Present:

Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Shri Sanjay Kumar learned counsel for the applicant through

video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Chargesheet not received from the concerned Court. Let a reminder be sent for the next date i.e. 17.09.2020.

FIR No. 448/2019

Under Section: 33/38/58 Excise Act

Police Station: Nihal Vihar

State vs Naresh Kumar Yadav

14.09.2020

Present:

Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Shri Harsh and S.L. Sahangi learned counsel for the applicant.

This is an application for grant of bail to applicant/accused Naresh Kumar Yadav on the ground that he is innocent and is ready to join the investigation in this case.

Reply filed.

The applicant is the owner of the vehicle which was alleged to have been used in the transportation of illicit liquor by the co accused who has been granted bail according to the applicant's counsel.

Let the applicant join the investigation as and when called by the IO.

Put up for disposal of the bail application on 26.09.2020. The applicant be not arrested till the next date.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08

West District, THC Delhi

FIR No. 827/2020

Under Section: 323/341/325/354/354A/506/509/34 IPC

Police Station : Ranhola State vs Manvir Lakra

14.09.2020

Present: Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Shri Mahesh Kumar Patel learned counsel for the applicant/ac

cused.

Sh. Kush Sharma counsel for complainant.

IO in person.

This is an application under section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant/accused Manvir Lakra.

It is submitted that the petition is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi regarding some directions to the investigating agency, which is now fixed for 17.09.2020. It is submitted by the counsel for applicant that initially the FIR was registered under bailable offences and during the investigation section 354/354A and 325 were added. He further submits that the applicant is ready to join the investigation as and when called by the investigating officer and should be given a notice of arrest as per the judgment of *Arnesh Kumar vs State of Bihar & Anr. 2014(3)JCC 1529*.

On the other hand, learned counsel for complainant submits that the investigating agency has not invoked section 307 IPC which is clearly made out in this case. He further submits that the applicant is absconding that is why the investigating officer is not in a position to serve notice upon him. Investigating officer also endorsed this fact that the accused is absconding and non-bailable warrants were issued against the applicant. Lastly, the counsel for complainant has raised an apprehension that the complainant has a perception of threat

Ash

and danger from the accused persons and that is why she is not living at her home now a days.

Learned Public Prosecutor has also opposed the bail application.

After hearing all concerned and in the the overall facts and circumstances of the case, let the applicant / accused first join the investigation so that there is no delay in the further investigation of this case. He shall join the investigation as and when called by the IO and specifically on 16.09.2020 at 5:00 pm at the police station. The anticipatory bail application shall be decided on the next date of hearing. Further till the next date, it is directed that the applicant / accused be not arrested.

Put up for 18.09.2020.

Copy of order be given Dasti.

FIR No. 0342/2020

Under Section: 308/34 IPC

Police Station: Mundka

State vs Sunil & Others

14.09.2020

Present:

Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Shri Praveen Vashistha learned counsel for the applicant./ac

cused.

This is an application for grant of regular bail moved on behalf of applicant / accused Sunil Kumar.

Reply to the bail application received from the investigating officer.

It is submitted that the applicant / accused was gratned interim bail for 45 days vide order dated 11.08.2020.

Since all the interim orders have been extended till 31.10.2020 by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) 3037/2020 dated 24.08.2020, therefore, it is expedient that this application of bail be heard on 26.10.2020.

Put up for hearing of regular bail application moved on behalf of applicant Sunil Kumar on **26.10.2020**.

FIR No. 58/2020

Under Section: 394/397/459/34 IPC &

25/27/57/59 Arms Act

Police Station: Mundka

State vs Ashok Kumar

14 09.2020

Shri Santosh Kumar; learned Additional Public Prosecutor Present:

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Learned counsel for the applicant.

The applicant Ashok Kumar seeking interim bail in this case on the grounds of recommendations of the High Powered Committed of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 18.04.2020 stating that applicant is innocent and has no other case against him.

It is correct that as per the reply of the investigating officer that the applicant is the first offender but the allegations are serious in nature and the case of the applicant is not covered under the guidelines of the High powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

In these circumstances, the applicant is not entitled for interim bail as he has failed to put forth any exceptional circumstance required to obtain interim bails as per law.

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent concerned.

Addl. Sessions Judge-08 West District, THC Delhi

Bail application No. 1877

FIR No. 805/2020

Under Section: 354/354A/509 IPC

Police Station: Nihal Vihar

State vs Dharamveer

14.09.2020

Present:

Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex). Shri Pankaj Jaiswal learned counsel for the applicant.

ASI Padam Singh in person.

Learned counsel for victim through video conferencing.

Reply to the bail application received from the investigating officer.

This is an application under section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant/accused Dharamveer stating that the applicant is innocent and falsely implicated in the present case. It is stated in the application that on 05.03.2015 complainant was married with Naresh who is the own younger brother of applicant and the complainant and her husband moved a petition for dissolution of marriage which is pending before the learned Principal Judge Family Court. It is also stated that applicant has apprehension of arrest and therefore, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

On enquiry, it is submitted by the Investigating Officer that he has given notice to the applicant to join the investigation. In the first notice, he has joiend the investigation but not subsequently.

All the offences in the present case are punishable with a sentence of not more than seven years, and the investigating officer had not arrested the applicant despite his joining the investigating, therefore, it is feasible to dispose off this anticipatory bail application with the direction that if during investi-

YNY

gation sufficient grounds emerge to arrest the applicant, he may be given a notice to that effect.

In these circumstances, in case the need of arrest of the present applicant arises, Investigating Officer is directed to give seven days' notice before proceeding to arrest the applicant for the purpose of investigation.

Applicant is directed to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer, as per law.

Copy of FIR is supplied to the counsel for applicant at his request.

Application stands disposed off.

Copy of order be give Dasti and be also sent to the Investigating Officer for information.

FIR No. 219/2018 Police Station: Hari Nagar Jyoti Sharma vs State

14.09.2020

Present:

Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).
Shri Akash Mishra learned counsel for the applicant.

This is an application for cancellation of bail granted to respondent no. 2 Shailender Kumar

It is submitted by learned counsel for accused/applicant that he does not want to press the bail application and wants to withdraw the same.

In view of submission, the bail application of accused is dismissed as withdrawn.

The application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of order be given dasti.

(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi

FIR No. Not Known Under Section : Not known Police Station : Hari Nagar State vs Dharmendra Kumar

14.09.2020

Present: Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex). Shri Sanjeev Dwivedi learned counsel for the applicant.

This is an application for grant anticipatory bail to the applicant Dharmendra Kumar.

Let reply of the application be called from the IO for 22.09.2020.

(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi

FIR No. 218/2020

Under Section: 452/323/308/34 IPC

**Police Station: Anand Parabat** 

State vs

1. Julfikar Ali @ Bhutto Khan

2. Saddam

14.09.2020

Present:

Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).
Shri Sita ram Tanwar learned counsel for the applicant.

Reply to the bail application received from IO.

Put up for consideration on 22.09.2020.

(SAMAR VISHAL)

Addl. Sessions Judge-08 West District, THC Delhi

FIR No. 816/2019

**Under Section: 307/34 IPC Police Station : Nihal Vihar** 

State vs Inderjeet Yadav

14.09.2020

Shri Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor Present:

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Shri Manoj Goswami, learned counsel for the applicant.

This is an application for grant of bail to applicant/accused Inderjeet Yaday stating that he has been falsely implicated in the present case and is in judicial custody since 07.06.2020. It is further stated that the applicant is sole bread earner member of the family and he has three sisters to take care beside his age parents. It is further stated that the nothing incriminating has been recovered from the applicant / accused.

Reply to the bail application received from the investigating officer, according to which the present case was registered on the complaint of injured Deepak Mathur in which he stated that accused Narender @ Akhtar alongwith other two other unknown co-accused persons fired at him in order to kill him. During investigation 6 empty cartridges of 7.65 MM and one bullet lead was recovered from the spot. Later on accused Narender Sharma @ Akhtar was also arrested in the case FIR No. 8/20 PS Rajpark in which 2 pistol of 7.65 mm and one country made pistol of 8 mm were recovered and the same were sent to FSL Rohini. Later on 07.06.2020 the present applicant / accused Inderjeet Singh @ Inder was arrested and sent to judicial custody. During TIP proceedings, complainant correctly identified the accused Inderjeet Singh @ Inder. The present case is related to gang war between two criminal groups that is Narender @ Akhtar and Mathur. According to IO, if bail is granted to the ac-

cused there could be serious law and order problem in the area. Further, one of the accused Sumit @ Passon is absconding and evading his arrest.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application stating that the allegations against the applicant are quite grave.

The allegations against the applicant are serious. The case is at the initial stage and chargesheet is recently filed. In case, the charge is framed, the prosecution evidence will have to commence, hence there is apprehension that applicant may threaten the witnesses or may tamper the evidence, if released on bail. Further, two bail applications have already been dismissed and this is the third bail application without any fresh ground or change in circumstances of the case.

In these circumstances, I do not find any justifiable ground to allow the bail application of applicant, hence the same stands dismissed.

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of order be given Dasti.

cused there could be serious law and order problem in the area. Further, one of the accused Sumit @ Passon is absconding and evading his arrest.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application stating that the allegations against the applicant are quite grave.

The allegations against the applicant are serious. The case is at the initial stage and chargesheet is recently filed. In case, the charge is framed, the prosecution evidence will have to commence, hence there is apprehension that applicant may threaten the witnesses or may tamper the evidence, if released on bail. Further, two bail applications have already been dismissed and this is the third bail application without any fresh ground or change in circumstances of the case.

In these circumstances, I do not find any justifiable ground to allow the bail application of applicant, hence the same stands dismissed.

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of order be given Dasti.