

FIR No. 160/2020
u/s 376/323/384/506/34 IPC
PS: DBG Road
State V. Vikas Kajla

14.09.2020

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. Vinay Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the accused through

VC.

Complainant/victim with counsel Sh. Mohd. Azhruddin present physically.

It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for the complainant/victim that he has supplied the copy of the cancellation of the bail application to the counsel for the accused today itself in the morning. Ld. counsel for the accused has submitted that he has received the copy of the same and sought adjournment to file reply on the same.

Heard. In view of the submissions, put up for filing of reply on the same application being filed by the counsel for complainant and for arguments on 28.09.2020. **Interim order to continue till next date of hearing.**

Intimation be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.



(SATISH KUMAR)
ASJ/SFTC-2(CENTRAL),
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.
14.09.2020

FIR No. 120/2018
u/s 376/457 PC
PS: Gulabi Bagh
State Vs. Ram Chander

14.09.2020

File taken up on the application being filed by the complainant/victim for interim compensation under the Victim Compensation Scheme.

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Complainant/victim with counsel Sh. Anant Mishra present physically.

Heard.

The testimony of the complainant/victim is to be recorded in the court and till the recording of the testimony of the complainant/victim and till her cross-examination is completed, let the application be kept in abeyance.

Be put up on **21.09.2020**.



(SATISH KUMAR)
ASJ/SFTC-2(CENTRAL),
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.
14.09.2020

Case No. 656/2019
FIR No. 90/2019
u/s 376D/328/354D/506 IPC
PS: I P Estate
State Vs. Raj Kumar and Ors.

14.09.2020

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Kedar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for accused Rahul through VC.
On request, adjourned for **arguments on 23.09.2020**.
Complainant/victim as well as IO be summoned for next date.


(SATISH KUMAR)
ASJ/SFTC-2(CENTRAL),
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.
14.09.2020

FIR No. 132/2019
u/s 376/323/506 IPC
PS: Nabi Karim
State Vs. Baljeet Singh

14.09.2020

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. S.N. Shukla, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant through VC.

Complainant/victim is present through VC.

Ms. Lakshmi Raina, Ld. Counsel for DCW through V.C.

Arguments heard on the interim bail application of applicant/accused Baljeet Singh s/o Surender Singh.

It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is suffering from Piles and skin disease and because of the Covid-19 Pandemic, he is not getting proper treatment in the jail. It is further submitted by Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that interim bail may kindly be granted to the applicant/accused.

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

Heard.

Perusal of the report received from Jail Superintendent in respect of the disease suffering by the accused has been perused and it has been categorically mentioned by Jail Superintendent in respect of the disease that *“the inmate is known case of extensive Tinea Corporis and Internal Hemorrhoids Grade-3. He is suffering from itching and rashes on chest,*



...back, mugs and gown and from pain and bleeding per rectum during defecation, mass coming out of anus during defecation and constipation”.

Having heard the submissions made by Id. counsel for applicant/accused, Id. 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 applicant/accused is suffering from skin disease and Hemorrhoids.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, 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.

Bail application is stands disposed of accordingly.



(SATISH KUMAR)
ASJ/SFTC-2(CENTRAL),
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.
14.09.2020

Case No. 861/2019
FIR No. 81/2019
u/s 376/506 IPC
PS: Rajinder Nagar
State Vs. Rakesh Kumar Meena

14.09.2020

Present: Sh. Ateeq Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Accused in person physically in court.

Sh. Manish Malik, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant physically in court.

Complainant in person physically in court.

Parents of accused/applicant present physically in court.

Father of complainant/victim present physically in court.

Arguments heard on the regular bail application of applicant/accused Rakesh Kumar Meena.

It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is on interim bail for the last many months as he was granted interim bail on the ground that he had solemnized marriage with complainant/victim and the complainant/victim is residing happily with the accused/applicant. It is further submitted by Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that regular bail may kindly be granted to the applicant/accused.

Per Contra, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application.

Heard.

Complainant/victim and father of complainant/victim have submitted that they have no objection if the bail is granted to the



applicant/accused.

Having heard the submissions made by Id. counsel for applicant/accused 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 complainant/victim is living happily with the applicant/accused and she has no objection if the applicant/accused is admitted on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this court is of the considered view that applicant/accused is admitted to bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- each with one surety in the like amount. Bail bonds have already been furnished.

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

Bail application is stands disposed of accordingly.



(SATISH KUMAR)
ASJ/SFTC-2(CENTRAL),
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.
14.09.2020

Case No. 09/2019
FIR No. 117/2018
u/s 376/506 IPC
PS: Maurice Nagar
State Vs. Sarabjeet @ Lucky

14.09.2020

Present: Sh. Ateeque Ahmad, Ld. APP for the State.
Complainant/victim with her father physically in the court.

It is submitted by the complainant/victim that she had registered an FIR on dated 17.09.2018 i.e. FIR No. 0117/2018 u/s 376/506 IPC, PS Maurice Nagar against the accused and in that case FIR, her testimony has already been recorded and the trial is concluded and only the court has to pronounce the final order.

It is further submitted that the mother of the accused, time and again make a call and pressurized her to withdraw the case with consideration and on 08.09.2020, she has received a call at 2.04 pm from the mobile phone number 8384034199 on her mobile phone number 7291882449 and she had made a complaint to the SHO PS Bindapur, New Delhi but till date, no action has been taken by the SHO PS Bindapur.

Heard. In view of the submissions made by complainant/victim and Ld. APP for the State, **notice be issued to the SHO PS Bindapur to obtain the CDR of the above stated both the mobile phone numbers from 01.09.2020 to 10.09.2020. SHO is also directed to verify in whose name and address, the mobile phone number 8384034199 has been issued.**

Copy of this order with the copy of complaint made by the



:2:

complainant/victim dated 09.09.2020 be sent to the SHO PS Bindapur to file the action taken report of dated 09.09.2020 reference number 81760012002602 on or before 12.10.2020.



**(SATISH KUMAR)
ASJ/SFTC-2(CENTRAL),
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI
14.09.2020**

Case No. 09/2019
FIR No. 117/2018
u/s 376/506 IPC
PS: Maurice Nagar
State Vs. Sarabjeet @ Lucky

14.09.2020

Present: Sh. Ateeque Ahmad, Ld. APP for the State.
Sh. Sachin Jain, Ld. Counsel for the accused through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the accused has submitted that next date of hearing in the Hon'ble High Court is 07.10.2020.

Be put up on **12.10.2020**.

Ld. Counsel for accused is directed to let aware this court about the order of the Hon'ble High Court.



(SATISH KUMAR)
ASJ/SFTC-2(CENTRAL),
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI
14.09.2020

Case No. 09/2019
FIR No. 117/2018
u/s 376/506 IPC
PS: Maurice Nagar
State Vs. Sarabjeet @ Lucky

09.09.2020

Present: Sh. Ateeque Ahmad, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. Pradeep Rana, Ld. Counsel for accused through VC.
Sh. Sachin Kumar Jain, Ld. Counsel for accused from DLSA through VC.

Ms. Lakshmi Raina, Ld. Counsel for DCW through VC.

Sh. Gurcharan Singh and Smt. Rajender Kaur, parents of the accused are present in court through VC.

An application was moved by Sh. Pradeep Rana, Advocate stating that he is not the counsel of the accused Sarabjeet and he has moved an application to withdraw his vakalatnama on the last date of hearing. The court has issued the parokar to the parents of the accused Sarabjeet, who are present physically in the court and when the court asked about their Advocate, then they have submitted that now Sh. Pradeep Rana, Advocate is not the Advocate of their son and he may be discharged. However, the mother of the accused has submitted that she wants to place on record the copy of the complaint made by her against Sh. Pradeep Rana, Advocate. Request allowed.

Copy of complaint be taken on record.

Be put up on **14.09.2020 for further orders.**

In the meantime, Ld. Counsel for the accused from DLSA is directed to place on record the copy of the order-sheet of the Hon'ble High



Court of Delhi in which the dismissal order of the application u/s 311 Cr.P.C.
has been challenged.



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

09.09.2020