

: 1 :

IN THE COURT OF SH. NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-04: CENTRAL:
TIS HAZARI COURTS: DELHI

Application No.:1473/2020
State Vs Anil Kumar
FIR No.19/2020
P. S. NDRS
U/s: 411, 413 IPC

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Learned Addl. PP for State is
available through VC.

Mr. Salil Kumar Jha, learned counsel for accused
through VC.

Vide this order, bail application u/s 439 Cr.PC dated 06/10/2020 filed by applicant through counsel is disposed off.

It is stated in the application that he is in JC since 02/08/2020; that his age is about 26 years only; that he has been falsely implicated in the present case; that his earlier bail application was dismissed vide order dated 14/09/2020; that fresh ground for bail is that now he is granted bail in e-FIR No. 427/2020 PS Nazafgarh. Copy of this order is annexed with the present application. It is stated that investigation is complete and the chargesheet is now under scrutiny. That two co-accused are already granted bail and one is discharged. It is further stated that offence u/s 413 IPC is not made out. As such, it is prayed that he be granted regular bail.

On the other hand, in reply filed by the IO, as also argued by learned Addl.PP for the State it is stated that no commission of the present accused is found. That he was arrested on the spot with 26 stolen ATM cards one of which related to FIR at PS Bhajan Pura and another one at PS Nazafgarh. That his bail application is already dismissed on 14/09/2020.

Application No.: 1447/2020
State Vs Yashir Shikari s/o Sajjid
FIR No.19001/2020
P. S.Sarai Rohilla
U/s: 379, 411, 34 IPC

As such, present bail application is opposed.

I have heard both the sides.

The personal liberty is a priceless treasure for a human being. It is founded on the bed rock of constitutional right and accentuated further on human rights principle. The sanctity of liberty is the fulcrum of any civilized society. Deprivation of liberty of a person has enormous impact on his mind as well as body. Further article 21 Of the Constitution mandates that no person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. Further India is a signatory to the International Covenant On Civil And Political Rights, 1966 and, therefore, Article 21 of the Constitution has to be understood in the light of the International Covenant On Civil And Political Rights, 1966. *Further* Presumption of innocence is a human right. Article 21 in view of its expansive meaning not only protects life and liberty, but also envisages a fair procedure. Liberty of a person should not ordinarily be interfered with unless there exist cogent grounds therefor. The fundamental principle of our system of justice is that a person should not be deprived of his liberty except for a distinct breach of law. If there is no substantial risk of the accused fleeing the course of justice, there is no reason why he should be imprisoned during the period of his trial. The basic rule is to release him on bail unless there are circumstances suggesting the possibility of his fleeing from justice or thwarting the course of justice. When bail is refused, it is a restriction on personal liberty of the individual guaranteed by Article 21 of the Constitution.

Further it has been laid down from the earliest time that the object of Bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of Bail. The object of Bail is neither punitive nor preventive. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment unless it can be required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The courts owe more than verbal respect to the

principle that punishment begins after convictions, and that every man is deemed to be innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty. From the earlier times, it was appreciated that detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. From time to time, necessity demands that some unconvicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial, but in such case 'necessity' is the operative test. In this country, it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the constitution that any persons should be punished in respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances. Apart from the question of prevention being the object of a refusal of bail, one must not lose sight of the fact that any imprisonment before conviction has a substantial punitive content and it would be improper for any court to refuse bail as mark of disapproval of former conduct whether the accused has been convicted for it or not or to refuse bail to an unconvicted person for the purpose of giving him a taste of imprisonment as a lesson. While considering an application for bail either under Section 437 or 439 CrPC, the court should keep in view the principle that grant of bail is the rule and committal to jail an exception. Refusal of bail is a restriction on personal liberty of the individual guaranteed by Article 21 of the Constitution. Seriousness of the offence not to be treated as the only consideration in refusing bail : Seriousness of the offence should not to be treated as the only ground for refusal of bail. (Judgment of **Sanjay Chandra Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation, AIR 2012 SC 830** relied).

But, the liberty of an individual is not absolute. The Society by its collective wisdom through process of law can withdraw the liberty that it has sanctioned to an individual when an individual becomes a danger to

the societal order. A society expects responsibility and accountability from the member, and it desires that the citizens should obey the law, respecting it as a cherished social norm. Therefore, when an individual behaves in a disharmonious manner ushering in disorderly thing which the society disapproves, the legal consequences are bound to follow.

Further discretionary jurisdiction of courts u/s 437 and 439 CrPC should be exercised carefully and cautiously by balancing the rights of the accused and interests of the society. Court must indicate brief reasons for granting or refusing bail. Bail order passed by the court must be reasoned one but detailed reasons touching merits of the case, detailed examination of evidence and elaborate documentation of merits of case should not be done.

At this stage , it can also be fruitful to note that requirements for bail u/s 437 & 439 are different. Section 437 Cr.P.C. severally curtails the power of the Magistrate to grant bail in context of the commission of non-bailable offences punishable with death or imprisonment for life, the two higher Courts have only the procedural requirement of giving notice of the Bail application to the Public Prosecutor, which requirement is also ignorable if circumstances so demand. The regimes regulating the powers of the Magistrate on the one hand and the two superior Courts are decidedly and intentionally not identical, but vitally and drastically dissimilar. (**Sundeep Kumar Bafna Vs. State of Maharashtra, AIR 2014 SC 1745**).

Further at this stage it can be noted that interpreting the provisions of bail contained u/s 437 & 439 Cr.P.C., the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its various judgments has laid down various considerations for grant or refusal of bail to an accused in a non-bailable offence like, (i) Whether there is any prima facie or reasonable ground to believe that the accused had committed the offence; (ii) Nature of accusation and evidence therefor, (iii) Gravity of the offence and punishment which the conviction

will entail, (iv) Reasonable possibility of securing presence of the accused at trial and danger of his absconding or fleeing if released on bail, (v) Character and behavior of the accused, (vi) Means, position and standing of the accused in the Society, (vii) Likelihood of the offence being repeated, (viii) Reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, (ix) Danger, of course, of justice being thwarted by grant of bail, (x) Balance between the rights of the accused and the larger interest of the Society/State, (xi) Any other factor relevant and peculiar to the accused. (xii) While a vague allegation that the accused may tamper with the evidence or witnesses may not be a ground to refuse bail, but if the accused is of such character that his mere presence at large would intimidate the witnesses or if there is material to show that he will use his liberty to subvert justice or tamper with the evidence, then bail will be refused. Furthermore, in the landmark judgment of **Gurucharan Singh and others v. State** (AIR 1978 SC 179), it was held that there is no hard and fast rule and no inflexible principle governing the exercise of such discretion by the courts. It was further held that there cannot be any inexorable formula in the matter of granting bail. It was further held that facts and circumstances of each case will govern the exercise of judicial discretion in granting or refusing bail. It was further held that such question depends upon a variety of circumstances, cumulative effect of which must enter into the judicial verdict. Such judgment itself mentioned the nature and seriousness of nature, and circumstances in which offences are committed apart from character of evidence as some of the relevant factors in deciding whether to grant bail or not.

Further it may also be noted that it is also settled law that while disposing of bail applications u/s 437/439 Cr.P.C., courts should assign reasons while allowing or refusing an application for bail. But detailed reasons touching the merit of the matter should not be given which may prejudice the accused. What is necessary is that the order

should not suffer from non-application of mind. At this stage a detailed examination of evidence and elaborate documentation of the merit of the case is not required to be undertaken. Though the court can make some reference to materials but it cannot make a detailed and in-depth analysis of the materials and record findings on their acceptability or otherwise which is essentially a matter of trial. Court is not required to undertake meticulous examination of evidence while granting or refusing bail u/s 439 of the CrPC.

In the present case, it is a matter of record that accused is in JC since 02/08/2020. Further, as far as present accused is concerned, nothing remains to be recovered at his instance. In fact, the period for seeking police remand is already over. As such, no purpose would be served by keeping such accused in JC. Trial is likely to take time. Further, it may be noted that there is fundamental presumption of innocence in any criminal case of present nature. In present case, no previous conviction or even involvement in criminal cases is placed on record by the IO. Further, in the FIR mentioned in the earlier order of dismissal of bail of present accused, now such accused is granted bail by the concerned court at PS Nazafgarh vide order dated 17/09/2020. Further, he is already granted bail in another connected FIR in PS Bhajanpura on 08/09/2020.

In above facts and circumstances, such accused is granted bail subject to furnishing of **personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with two sound surety of like amount**, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial court and the following additional conditions:

- i) That he will appear before IO / Trial Court as and when called as per law.*
- ii) He will not indulge in any kind of activities which are alleged against him in the present case.*
- iii) That he will not leave Delhi without prior permission of the Trial Court concerned.*

: 7 :

iv) He will not threaten the witness or tampering with evidence.

v) He shall convey any change of address immediately to the IO and the court;

vi) He shall also provide his mobile number to the IO and further share his location through mobile phone once in everyweek till filing of chargesheet and thereafter as may be directed by the learned Trial Court.

It is clarified that in case if the applicant/ accused is found to be violating any of the above conditions, the same shall be a ground for cancellation of bail and the State shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail.

I may observe that certain guidelines had been laid down by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the case of ***“Ajay Verma Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi”*** WP (C) 10689/2017 dated 08.03.2018 wherein it was observed and I quote as under:

“..... The trial courts should not only be sensitive but extremely vigilant in cases where they are recording orders of bail to ascertain the compliance thereof.....When bail is granted, an endorsement shall be made on the custody warrant of the prisoner, indicating that bail has been granted, along with the date of the order of bail.

- a) In case of inability of a prisoner to seek release despite an order of bail, it is the judicial duty of the trial courts to undertake a review for the reasons thereof.*
- b) Every bail order shall be marked on the file.*
- c) It shall be the responsibility of every judge issuing an order of bail to monitor its execution and enforcement.*
- d) In case a judge stands transferred before the execution, it shall be the*

: 8 :

responsibility of the successor judge to ensure execution.....”

I note that in the present case the bail bonds have been directed to be furnished before the Ld. Trial Court/ Ld. MM and hence in terms of the above observations, the Ld. MM is impressed upon to inform this court about the following:

- a) *The date on which conditions imposed by this court are satisfied;*
- b) *The date of release of prisoner from jail;*
- c) *Date of ultimate release of prisoner in case the prisoner is in jail in some other case.*

The copy of this order be sent to **Ld. MM** and also to the **Superintendent Jail** who shall also inform this court about all the three aspects as contained in the para herein above. The Superintendent Jail is also directed to inform this court if the prisoner is willingly not furnishing the personal bond or in case if he is unable to furnish the surety or any other reason given by the prisoner for not filing the bonds. One copy of this order be also sent to the **SHO Concerned** to ensure compliance.

The bail application is accordingly disposed off. Learned counsel for applicant is at liberty to obtain through electronic mode. Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent. Copy of this order be sent to IO / SHO concerned. Copy of order be uploaded on website.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
(NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP)
ASJ-04(Central/Delhi)
20.10.2020

Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:04:38
+05'30'

Anticipatory Bail

**Bail Matters No.: 1523, 1524, 1525 /2020
State Vs Parveen @ Kavita, Gulshan Kumar & Rahul
FIR No. :205/2020
PS: I.P. Estate
U/S: 406, 420, 34 IPC**

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. Naresh Kumar Talwar, learned counsel for Accused through VC.
IO also present through VC.
Mr. Tarun Sharma, learned counsel for complainant present through VC.

Vide this common order, anticipatory bail applications of accused / applicants Parveen @ Kavita, Gulshan Kumar and Rahul dated 12/10/2020 under section 438 Cr.P.C. on behalf of accused filed through counsel are disposed off.

In nutshell, in the present case, it is submitted on behalf of these accused persons that the complainant is known to accused side for the last three years and having friendly relationship. Complainant approached the accused for purchase of one floor of property bearing No. D31, Second Floor, Vikram Nagar Dariya Ganj for a sum of Rs. 2 crore 50 Lacs. That on his assurance accused side started construction work. But no document was prepared regarding the same. That complainant paid some amount thereafter stopped paying the balance and by misrepresentation acquired possession of one room of ground floor and started living in the same. When accused side demanded rest of the payment he refused the same and implicated the accused side in the present criminal case. It is stated that dispute is purely civil in nature. That there is spread of

**Bail Matters No.: 1523, 1524, 1525 /2020
State Vs Parveen @ Kavita, Gulshan Kumar & Rahul
FIR No. :205/2020
PS: I.P. Estate
U/S: 406, 420, 34 IPC**

corona virus. That accused side has roots in society and all permanent resident of Delhi. That they are ready to join the investigation as and when so directed. As such, it is prayed that they be granted anticipatory bail. During the course of arguments, it is further argued by the learned counsel for accused that building is not yet complete because of non fulfillment of promise to pay by the complainant side. It is further stated that accused side is suffering a lot financially and mentally.

On the other hand, it is argued by the learned counsel for complainant that accused misrepresented the complainant and complainant paid a sum of Rs. 45 lac through banking system on the promise of accused side to sell to the complainant a two BHK flat in such building.

Further it is argued by the IO and the learned Addl.PP for the State that investigation is at initial stage, that in any case as per the investigation so far, such property is non transferable in nature as per law. Further, no construction can be carried out in law including the MCD law. It is further stated that building is complete in any case. Thus, it is stated in any case it is a clear case of cheating to promise to sell a property which cannot be sold as per law.

I have heard all the sides and gone through the record.

The conduct of the complainant as well as accused is not above suspicion. The complainant is supposed to know the law of the land including that no immovable property can be transferred or sold having value about 100 rupees without a sale deed in compliance with the provisions of transfer of property, registration act, stamp duty act, and relevant municipal laws relating to constructions of a building. But

Bail Matters No.: 1523, 1524, 1525 /2020
State Vs Parveen @ Kavita, Gulshan Kumar & Rahul
FIR No. :205/2020
PS: I.P. Estate
U/S: 406, 420, 34 IPC

having observed so, it is also prima facie appears that such property is non transferable by its very nature. Therefore, the action on the part of accused side to sell the same is prima facie satisfied the ingredients of section 420 IPC. But, it is not clear out of these three accused persons which of the accused persons played what part in committing the such offence. As such, put up for further arguments in this regard. In the meanwhile, IO is directed not to take any coercive action against these accused persons subject to they join the investigation as and when called by IO as per law till next date of hearing only.

Put up for further arguments and appropriate orders for **28/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:05:19
+05'30'

(NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP)
ASJ-04(Central/Delhi/20/10/2020)

Bail Matters No.: 1523, 1524, 1525 /2020
State Vs Parveen @ Kavita, Gulshan Kumar & Rahul
FIR No. :205/2020
PS: I.P. Estate
U/S: 406, 420, 34 IPC

Bail Matters No.:1537/2020
State Vs Sonu @ Amrit Kundra
FIR No. :251/2019
PS: Prashad Nagar

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Proxy counsel for th applicant.
Mr. Prabhat Kumar, learnd counsel for non applicant.

This is an application for cancellation of bail.

Learned counsel for the applicant is not available. Passover is sought. But due to a number of cases pending, the same is not possible.

As such, put up for arguments on this application for **28/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:05:52
+05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1539/2020
State Vs Shiva
FIR No. :64/2020
PS: Lahori Gate

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. P.K. Garg, learned counsel for the applicant through VC.

This is an application for grant of interim bail based on the interim bail criteria by the High Power Committee. This application is filed on 14/10/2020 i.e. after 30/---/2020.

As such, benefit of such criteria cannot be given as per the minutes of meeting of such High Power Committee. Present application is dismissed accordingly with liberty to file afresh on merit.

NAVEEN
KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20
19:06:22 +05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1569/2020
State Vs Virender Kalu
FIR No.: 88/2020
PS: Sarai Rohilla

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. Nitin Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant through VC.

This is an application for interim bail based on medical condition of the wife of accused.

Reply filed by the IO. But the same does not relate to the present issue on which interim bail application is filed. As such, IO / SHO is directed to file reply particularly regarding verification and status of medical condition of his wife.

Put up for **22/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by NAVEEN
KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:06:40
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1213/2020
State Vs Neeraj @ Nonu
FIR No. :297/2018
PS:Prashad Nagar

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
None for the applicant / accused.
Mr. Sparsh Chaudhary, learned counsel for complainant.

Put up for appearance of learned counsel for the applicant / accused for arguments on this 3rd bail application for **28/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:06:55 +05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1331/2020
State Vs Roopak Jain
FIR No. : Not Known
PS: Darya Ganj
U/s 420 IPC
DD Entry No.: GD50 dated 10/02/2020

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.

Vide this order application dated 22/09/2020 U/s 438 Cr.PC is decided.

It is argued by learned counsel for the applicant that they received a notice from SI Sonam Raj from PS Darya Ganj in respect of alleged complaint against the present applicant Roopak Jain regarding the purchase order. Such notice was given in writing by the police. The applicant has reasonable apprehension as such that he may be implicated and arrested in a criminal case without any legal basis. That he has already joined the investigation and ready to cooperate in the investigation if required. It is further argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that earlier SI Sonal Raj filed a short reply dated 24/09/2020 stating that this application is not maintainable at this stage. Further, such reply was duly forwarded by SHO PS Darya Ganj. But learned predecessor passed certain order and thereafter a detail reply dated 05/10/2020 is now filed. In such reply, it is mentioned and admitted that a complaint was received regarding non payment of certain purchase order and during course of inquiry notice was served upon the present applicant and he joined the inquiry and gave his reply in the present matter. Ultimately it is found that the case is of civil nature and no cognizable offence is made out. As such, it is argued by the learned counsel that the course of action adopted by the IO and SHO concerned is wholly unwarranted and against the provisions of section 154 / 155 Cr.PC as well as there is no provision of such inquiry in law including as also settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in five Judges Bench in the case of Lalita Kumari.

I have heard both the sides and gone through the record.

The course of action adopted by the concerned police official is not tenable in law particularly by virtue of section 155 Cr.PC. Further, it is admitted case of police itself that no cognizable offence is made out. Therefore, there is no occasion to register an FIR also.

Contd..../-

:2:

**Bail Matters No.:1331/2020
State Vs Roopak Jain**

Despite so, concerned SI and SHO failed to explain under what provisions of law they proceeded further and issued notice to the present applicant to join the alleged inquiry in question. It may be noted that section 160 Cr.PC comes into picture only when an FIR is registered that too of course a case of cognizable nature. As such, the course of action adopted by such police officers is totally unprofessional, untenable in law and infact violation of provision of law including u/s 155 Cr.PC.

A copy of this order need to be sent to worthy DCP concerned for his information and necessary action. Further, a copy of this order be sent to the learned Ilaka MM concerned. Both such copies be sent through Niab Court. Ahlmad is directed to do the needful accordingly. The acknowledgment of such copies be sent back to this court within one week by the Niab Court of this court.

Further under these circumstances, this court do not find that at present there is any reasonable apprehension of arrest of the present applicant in the present matter. As such, there is no occasion to grant the relief sought. With these observation present application is disposed off.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:07:14 +05'30'

Bail Matters No.:1489/2020
State Vs Sayed Waiz Ali
FIR No. :250/2020
PS: I.P. Estate
U/s 379, 411 IPC

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. M.N. Khan, learned counsel for applicant through VC.

Vide this order the application dated 24/09/2020 filed u/s 438 Cr.PC by the applicant / accused through counsel is disposed off.

It is argued in this application that on 03/08/2020 present accused was arrested at the instance of some local influential persons whose wards were involved in the quarrel with the present accused in road traffic accident. That present accused thereafter was shown arrested in kalandara case No. 17A/2020 and was falsely implicated in e-FIR No. 86/2020 PS Jama Masjid u/s 339 / 411 IPC and he was sent to judicial custody in that matter on 04/08/2020 and his bail application in that other matter was dismissed by learned MM. Ultimately he was granted interim bail in that other matter on 14/08/2020 by learned Session Court. As such it is claimed that he was in custody since 03/08/2020 till 14/08/2020. Hence, he cannot commit any crime in between as he was in judicial custody. Still police of PS I.P. Estate has implicated the applicant in the present case and visited his house on 19/09/2020. That present FIR was registered on 05/08/2020 when present accused was already in JC in FIR No. 86/2020 PS Jama Masjid. As such, it is clear that police wants to implicate the present case in false case. That he has roots in society. That he is ready to join investigation as and when so directed.

On the other hand, it is submitted by the learned Addl.PP for the State that in the present case accused committed the offence at 9:40 AM on 03/08/2020 whereas he was arrested in that other FIR No. 86/2020 on 04/08/2020 at 3:20 PM. As such, it is argued that

there is no substance in the arguments of learned counsel for present accused; that he is falsely implicated in the present theft matter. It is further submitted that present accused was caught with three stolen mobile phones. That he was already arrested in other FIR and was in JC and as such could not be arrested in the present case. It is further stated that presence of present accused is required for investigation. As such, he needs to be arrested. Accordingly, present anticipatory bail application is opposed.

I have heard both the sides and have gone through the record.

The alleged case property has already been recovered. Further, present accused is not arrested on the spot. as such, at present prima facie there is no ingredients of section 379 IPC as per the case of the prosecution and at best there is allegations of section 411 IPC. But nothing remains to be recovered in this regard. Further, there is certain directions by Hon'ble Supreme Court including in the case of Arnesh Kumar in offences punishable upto 7 years. Further, the power to register FIR and power to arrest are two different fields. The reply by the IO is received as to why such custody interrogation is required in the present case. Further, there is certain allegations / apprehensions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant which cannot be ignored altogether. Therefore, having regard to the nature of the case property involved and the gravity of the acquisition, the fact that there is no previous conviction against such accused, that he has roots in society, the IO / SHO concerned is directed to release the accused on bail in the event of his arrest in the present case, subject to present accused / applicant furnishing of personal bond in the sum of **Rs. 20,000/- with one sound surety of like amount** and subject to further following conditions.

- i) Applicant shall not flee from the justice;*
- ii) Applicant shall not tamper with the evidence;*
- iii) Applicant shall not threaten or contact in any manner to the prosecution witnesses ,*
- iv) Applicant shall not leave country without permission;*

- v) Applicant shall convey any change of address immediately to the IO and the court;*
- vi) Applicants shall also provide his/her mobile number to the IO;*
- vii) Applicant shall keep his / her such mobile number 'Switched On' at all the time , particularly between 8 am to 8 pm everyday till the chargesheet is filed*
- viii) That he / she will cooperate with the investigation / IO / SHO concerned and will appear before IO / Trial Court as and when called as per law.*
- ix) He will not indulge in any kind of activities which are alleged against him / her in the present case.*

With these observations the present application is disposed off. Both the sides are at liberty to obtain copy of the order through electronic mode.

NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Digitally signed by NAVEEN
KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:07:37 +05'30'

Bail Matters No.:1491/2020
State Vs Javed Khan
FIR No. : Not Known
PS: Darya Ganj
U/s Not Known

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. M.L. Gupta, learned counsel through VC.

Vide this order application dated 03/10/2020 U/s 438 Cr.PC is decided.

It is argued by learned counsel for the applicant that two police officials Parveen Kumar and Pankaj Kumar are making calls to the applicant and asking him to visit PS Darya Ganj. When applicant asks reason for the same, then such police officials did not disclose anything and just said in case applicant do not visit police station, a case will be registered against him. As such, it is claimed that the present applicant has great apprehensions to be arrested in case he visits the police station and implicated in a false and frivolous case. That he is ready to join the investigation as and when so directed.

In reply dated 13/10/2020 filed by SI Pankaj Kumar, SIU-I, Crime Branch that he was assigned the task of disposal of pending references in order to clear pendency of general complaints. In view of present pandemic situation applicant was contacted on his mobile number just for the veracity of the facts in the light of standing order No.167/89-matter of civil nature if presented to police giving the colour of cognizable offences. That present applicant sought sometime to file papers relating to purchase of some car. But instead of filing the same with police, filed the present application.

I have heard both the sides and gone through the record.

The course of action adopted by the concerned police official is not tenable in law particularly by virtue of section 154 Cr.PC. Further the so called standing order no. 167/89 cannot override the express provision of law particularly section 154, 160 and other related provisions of Cr.PC. Further, admittedly no FIR is registered relating to the complaint in question, therefore, there is no occasion to conduct any investigation or even preliminary inquiry particularly after the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Lalita Kumari. Further such intimation in any case can be given through SMS or other electronic mode in writing instead of a phone call which unnecessarily leads to doubt on the action of the police

Contd..../-

:2:

Bail Matters No.:1491/2020
State Vs Javed Khan

department. As such, concerned police officials are warned to be careful in future. Because of such unwarranted action the already overburdened courts are receiving such kind of anticipatory bail applications.

A copy of this order need to be sent to worthy Incharge Crime Branch his information. Further, a copy of this order be sent to the learned CMM for his information. Both such copies be sent through Niab Court. Ahlmad is directed to do the needful accordingly. The acknowledgment of such copies be sent back to this court within one week by the Niab Court of this court.

Further under these circumstances, this court do not find that at present there is any reasonable apprehension of arrest of the present applicant in the present matter. As such, there is no occasion to grant the relief sought. With these observation present application is disposed off.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:07:56 +05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1362/2020
State Vs Gopesh and others
FIR No. : 137/2020

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
None.

None is appearing since morning.

Put up for appearance of counsel for accused and for appropriate orders for

28/10/2020.

NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:08:12
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1571/2020
State Vs Dharmender Vs State
FIR No. : 256/2020
PS: Prashad Nagar

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. Bijender Sharma, learned counsel for the applicant through VC.

This is an application for anticipatory bail dated 16/10/2020.

Reply filed by the IO. Copy of the same be supplied to the counsel for the accused.

It is stated by the IO that she telephonically intimated the victim about the pendency of the present application. It is stated that victim / complainant is hospitalized at present and she is not aware whether till when she is admitted in hospital.

Heard. In any case, let fresh notice in writing through electronic mode or otherwise be served by the IO upon such complainant / victim at the time of further hearing of this anticipatory bail application.

At request, put up for arguments / appropriate orders for **22/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:08:30
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:990/2020
State Vs Manoj Kumar Sharma
FIR No. :191/2019
PS: Lahori Gate

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Learned counsel for applicant through VC.
Learned counsel for original complainant.

Further arguments heard.

Put up for orders / clarification, if any, at 4:00 PM.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP Digitally signed by NAVEEN
KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:08:48 +05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

At 4:00 PM

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.

Certain clarification is required including regarding the law relating to
subsequent anticipatory bail application.

In the facts and circumstances of the present case, put up for further arguments
for **23/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:09:03
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1541/2020
State Vs Sunny Sethi
FIR No. :272/2020
PS: I.P. Estate

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
None.

No time is left.

Put up for orders / clarification for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:09:19 +05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1543/2020
State Vs Sunny Sethi
FIR No. :201/2020
PS: I.P. Estate

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
None.

No time is left.

Put up for orders / clarification for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN
KUMAR
KASHYAP

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Digitally signed by NAVEEN
KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:09:36
+05'30'

Bail Matters No.:1558/2020
State Vs Rohit @ Bachan
FIR No. :20168/2020
PS: I.P. Estate

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Learned counsel for the applicant through VC.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:09:53
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Bail Matters No.:1570/2020
State Vs Aman Kumar Shavlu Sharma
FIR No. :11/2020
PS:Railway Main Delhi

20/10/2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Learned counsel for the applicant through VC.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:10:10
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

State Vs Rakesh
(Application of Rakesh)
FIR No. 236/2019
P. S. Subzi Mandi

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.
Mr. Shivendra Singh, learned counsel for accused through VC.

Further arguments heard.

Put up for orders / clarification, if any, for **21/10/2020** with case file.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:10:56 +05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

State Vs Gurcharan Singh @ Gabbar Singh
Application of Gurcharan Singh
FIR No.70/2008
P. S. Kashmere Gate

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.
None for the applicant.

Nobody is appearing on behalf of applicant since morning despite repeated calls. As such, this application is dismissed in default.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:11:18 +05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

State Vs Mukesh J Jardari Wakude & Others
(Application of Mukesh Jardari)
FIR No. 50/2010
P. S. Nabi Karim

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.

Mr. Rahul Parasar, learned counsel for the applicant / accused through VC.

Put up for arguments / appropriate orders on the application of applicant /
accused to go out of Delhi for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:11:33
+05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

State Vs Gaurav @ Kishan
(Application of Gaurav Kishan)
FIR No. 13/2017
P. S. Karol Bagh

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.
Mr. P.K. Garg, learned counsel for the applicant / accused through VC.

This is an application seeking release of Jamatalashi articles of Gaurav @
Kishan.

Put up for appropriate orders for **27/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:11:47 +05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

State Vs Ajay Sharma & others
(Application of Deepak @ Bunty)
FIR No. 506/2015
P. S. Nabi Karim

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.
None.

None is appearing since morning in the present case.

Put up for consideration / appropriate orders for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:12:00
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

State Vs Mahesh @ Mannu
FIR No. 699/2014
P. S. Karol Bagh

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.
None.

Put up for orders for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:12:14
+05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

State Vs Raja Babu @ Gandhi
FIR No. 146/2018
P. S. Timar Pur

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.
Mr. A. A. Qureshi, learned counsel for the accused through VC.
It is already 5:00 PM. No time left.

Put up for appropriate orders for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:12:28
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

FIR No: 83/2020
PS :Kashmiri Gate
U/s :,147,148,149,186,353,269,270,436,/34 IPC
State Vs.
1.Rohit,S/o Prem Mohan
2.Rohit(Subash S/o Umesh Ram
3.Laddan
4. Munna
5. Subhash,
6.Bhopal Singh.

14.10.2020

Vide this common order 6 separate Applications for modification of the bail order dt. 14/08/2020 moved on behalf of above mentioned applicants / accused person are disposed off.

Present: Ld. APP for State
Legal Aid Counsel Sh. S. N. Shukla for two of such Accused .
Legal Aid Counsel Sh. Chetanya Puri for four of such Accused ,.

Matter is taken up through Video Conferencing on account of COVID-19 lockdown.

Arguments heard. Reply perused.

By way of this application which has been moved through DLSA, Central District, it has been prayed that the applicants / accused may be released on personal bond by waiving off the relevant condition for furnishing surety bond, as imposed in bail order dt. 14/08/2020 passed by Sessions Court.

It is submitted by ld. Legal Aid Counsel appearing on behalf of applicant / accused that applicant belongs to poor strata of society and they are not in a position to produce surety in this case and therefore, they may be directed to be released on personal bond. In support of his submission, he has relied upon the following decisions : -

1. Court of its Motion Vs. State, W. P. (Crl.) No.779/2020 decided on 09.04.2020 by Hon'ble Delhi High Court.
2. Ajay Verma Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi W. P. (C) No.10689/2017 passed on 15.12.2017 and 08.03.2018 by Hon'ble Delhi High Court.
3. Moti Ran & Ors. Vs. State of M.P., (1978) 4 SCC 47.

On the other hand, the application is opposed by ld. Addl. PP on behalf of State on the ground that applicant should not be released on personal bond as the

allegations against him are quite serious and he may abscond and his presence may not be secured during trial in that eventuality.

I have bestowed my thoughtful consideration to the respectful submissions made on behalf of both sides and have also gone through the authorities cited on behalf of applicant.

It is an undisputed fact that bail order of applicant / accused in this case passed by Sessions Court on 14/08/2020 but they could not avail benefit of the bail order as they could not produce surety in this case. It is a matter of common knowledge that in view of pandemic situation, the applicant may be finding it difficult to arrange for surety. Moreover, they are stated to be belonging to financial poor family. Under these peculiar facts and circumstances and while taking guidance from the directions issued by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the above referred decisions, and the fact that more than two months are already passed since passing of such bail order, court is inclined to allow the application under consideration. Accordingly, these 6 applications are allowed and the bail order dt. 14/08/2020 passed in respect of applicant / accused in this case, stands modified only to the limited extent that he shall be released on bail on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction concerned Jail Superintendent. Rest of the conditions as mentioned in the said order, shall remain unchanged.

Copy of this order be given dasti to both the sides electronically, as per rules.

Attested copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent on his official e-mail ID for being delivered to the applicant / accused and for necessary compliance.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:15:27 +05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20/10/2020.

FIR No: 38/2020
PS :Kashmiri Gate
U/s :,147,148,149,186,353,269,270,436,/34 IPC
State Vs. Babu Bangali

14.10.2020

Present: Ld. APP for State
Legal Aid Counsel Sh. S. N. Shukla for such Accused .

Matter is taken up through Video Conferencing on account of COVID-19 lockdown.

Arguments heard. Reply perused.

By way of this application which has been moved through DLSA, Central District, it has been prayed that the applicant/ accused may be released on personal bond by waiving off the relevant condition for furnishing surety bond, as imposed in bail order dt. 14/08/2020 passed by Sessions Court.

It is submitted by ld. Legal Aid Counsel appearing on behalf of applicant / accused that applicant belongs to poor strata of society and they are is not in a position to produce surety in this case and therefore, he may be directed to be released on personal bond. In support of his submission, he has relief upon the following decisions : -

1. Court of its Motion Vs. State, W. P. (Crl.) No.779/2020 decided on 09.04.2020 by Hon'ble Delhi High Court.
2. Ajay Verma Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi W. P. (C) No.10689/2017 passed on 15.12.2017 and 08.03.2018 by Hon'ble Delhi High Court.
3. Moti Ran & Ors. Vs. State of M.P., (1978) 4 SCC 47.

On the other hand, the application is opposed by ld. Addl. PP on behalf of State on the ground that applicant should not be released on personal bond as the allegations against him are quite serious and he may abscond and his presence may not be secured during trial in that eventuality.

I have bestowed my thoughtful consideration to the respectful submissions made on behalf of both sides and have also gone through the authorities cited on behalf of applicant.

It is an undisputed fact that bail order of applicant / accused in this case

passed by Sessions Court on 05/08/2020 but they could not avail benefit of the bail order as they could not produce surety in this case. Moreover, he is stated to be belonging to financial poor family.

But having regard to the nature of offence alleged, and the period passed so far since when bail order was passed and the likelihood of his presence may not be secured for trial, if he is released on personal bond only and these facts and circumstances and while taking guidance from the directions issued by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the above referred decisions, court is inclined to allow the application under consideration *at present*. Accordingly, this application is dismissed

Copy of this order be given dasti to both the sides electronically, as per rules.

Attested copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent on his official e-mail ID for being delivered to the applicant / accused and for necessary compliance.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:16:11 +05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/26.09.2020

SC No.: 21/2020
FIR : 96/2018
PS: Gulabi Baghi
State Vs Vishal @ Lala & others

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

In the present case, last regular date of hearing were 29/04/2020, 22/06/2020 & 22/08/2020. Thereafter, as per directions from Hon'ble High Court, matter was adjourned was far due to lock-down. But in view of latest directions, matter is taken up today for hearing through VC.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for the State through VC.
None for the accused persons.

In the interest of justice, no adverse order is passed in the present case. Issue production warrant for the accused persons who are in JC, if any, for the next date of hearing.

Put up for appearance of accused persons for **05/03/2021**.

NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP
Digitally signed by NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:17:11 +05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

SC No.:260/2018
FIR :34387/2017
PS: Sarai Rohilla
State Vs: Furqan @ Rehan Abbasi @ Dhopa

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

In the present case, last regular date of hearing were 29/04/2020, 22/06/2020 & 22/08/2020. Thereafter, as per directions from Hon'ble High Court, matter was adjourned was far due to lock-down. But in view of latest directions, matter is taken up today for hearing through VC.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for the State through VC.
None for the accused.

In the interest of justice, no adverse order is passed in the present case. Issue production warrant for the accused persons who are in JC, if any, for the next date of hearing.

Put up for PE in terms of previous order for **08/03/2021**. Issue notice to two of the material witnesses for the next date of hearing.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:17:30
+05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

SC No.: 328/2017
FIR :327/2016
PS: Gulabi Bagh
State Vs: Ram Nawal

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

In the present case, last regular date of hearing were 29/04/2020, 22/06/2020 & 22/08/2020. Thereafter, as per directions from Hon'ble High Court, matter was adjourned was far due to lock-down. But in view of latest directions, matter is taken up today for hearing through VC.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for the State through VC.

Mr. S.N. Shukla, learned LAC for accused through VC.

It is stated that accused is on interim bail at present.

Put up for PE in terms of previous order for **08/03/2021**. Issue notice to two of the material witnesses for the next date of hearing.

NAVEEN
KUMAR
KASHYAP
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20
19:17:51 +05'30'

CC No.: 24/2017
PS : Enforcement Department
Assistant Director (PMLA) Vs Vineet Gupta & others

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.
Present: Mr. Atul Tripathi, special PP alongwith IO Mr. Sanjeet Sahu for ED.
Mr. Awanish Kumar, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Takur and Mr. Ruchit Dugar, learned counsel for applicant / accused No.14 Anirudh Aggarwal.

Arguments in detail heard for about one hour through VC on the application u/s 91 moved by the applicant / accused No.14 Anirudh Aggarwal.

Put up for orders / clarification, if any, for **06/11/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:18:10
+05'30'
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

CA No. 321/2018
Ravi Kant Vs CBI

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

In the present case, last regular date of hearing were 11/05/2020, 07/07/2020 & 07/09/2020. Thereafter, as per directions from Hon'ble High Court, matter was adjourned was far due to lock-down. But in view of latest directions, matter is taken up today for hearing through VC.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.

Present: Proxy counsel for the appellant through VC.

None for respondent / CBI.

Put up for arguments in terms of previous order for **06/03/2021**.

NAVEEN
KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by NAVEEN
KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:18:29
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

CA No. 322/2018
Rahul Jain Vs CBI

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

In the present case, last regular date of hearing were 29/04/2020, 22/06/2020 & 22/08/2020. Thereafter, as per directions from Hon'ble High Court, matter was adjourned was far due to lock-down. But in view of latest directions, matter is taken up today for hearing through VC.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.

Present: Mr. Satyabir Singh, learned counsel for appellant Rahul Jain alongwith appellant through VC.

None for respondent / CBI.

Put up for arguments in terms of previous orders for **06/03/2021**.

NAVEEN
KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20
19:18:46 +05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

CA No. 363/2019
Gaurav Saharawat Vs The State

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

In the present case, last regular date of hearing were 29/04/2020, 22/06/2020 & 22/08/2020. Thereafter, as per directions from Hon'ble High Court, matter was adjourned was far due to lock-down. But in view of latest directions, matter is taken up today for hearing through VC.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.

Present: None for appellant.

Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for the State through VC.

Put up for the purpose fixed in terms of previous orders for **05/03/2021**.

NAVEEN
KUMAR
KASHYAP

Digitally signed by NAVEEN
KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:19:21
+05'30'

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

FIR No. 50/2019
PS Nabi Karim
State Mukesh Jardari Wakude & others

File taken up today in terms of directions received vide letter No.:417/DHC/2020 of the Registrar General, Delhi High Court and Circular No.: 23456-23616/DJ(HQ)/Covid lockdown/Physical Courts Roster/2020 dated 30/08/2020 of Learned District & Sessions Judge(HQs), Delhi.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail Roster duty till further orders.
Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for the State through VC.
Learned counsel for applicant through VC.

No time left. Put up for appropriate orders for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN
KUMAR
KASHYAP
(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020

Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR
KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:19:39
+05'30'

**State Vs Mahesh @ Mannu
(Application for interim bail)
FIR No. 699/2014
P. S. Karol Bagh**

20.10.2020

This court is also discharging bail roster duty.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl.PP for State through VC.
None.

Put up for orders for **21/10/2020**.

NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Digitally signed by
NAVEEN KUMAR KASHYAP
Date: 2020.10.20 19:19:53
+05'30'

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/20.10.2020**