State vs. Urmila FIR no. 238/2018 under Section 302/120-B/34 IPC PS Sarai Rohilla 04.08.2020.

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing).

Present:

Ld. Addl. PP for State.

None for accused/applicant.

File taken up today as several applications have been received through email from Ld. LAC for accused/applicant praying therein to release accused/applicant named above on personal bond.

I have perused the record carefully.

Perusal of record shows that accused/applicant was ordered to be released on interim bail for a period of 45 days vide order dated 07.07.2020 on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount. As per record, accused/applicant could not be released from jail as she could not furnish surety/bail bond, hence, application in hand has been moved.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the order dated 07.07.2020 is hereby modified to the extent that accused/applicant i.e. Urmila is admitted to interim bail for a period of 45 days from the date of her release from jail on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Superintendent. Accused/applicant shall surrender before concerned Jail Superintendent on expiry of period of interim bail.

Application(s) stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy of present order as well as order dated 07.07.2020 be sent to

concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.

State Vs. Ebrin @ Rahul & Anr. FIR No. 32/2020 under Section 302/201/34 IPC PS Wazirabad

04.08.2020.

Fresh case received by way of assignment. It be checked and registered.

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

Present: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Both accused persons are not produced from JC.

Heard. Perused.

Now to come up on 30.09.2020 for arguments on point of

charge.

Issue production warrants qua both accused persons for

said date.

State Vs Afroz

under Section 22/29 NDPS Act and Section 63/65 Copy Right Act

PS: Crime Branch

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

Present:

Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

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

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant argued accused/applicant is presently on interim bail till 31.08.2020 granted by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 29.07.2020.

A specific query has been put to Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant as to how the present application under Section 439 of CrPC is maintainable when accused/applicant is not in judicial custody/jail.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant seeks adjournment for addressing arguments on said aspect.

Same is granted.

Now, to come up on 13.08.2020 for arguments and

disposal of application in hand.

e Vs. Kapil No. 366/2018 er Section 392/397/325/354/451/411 IPC Pahar Ganj

8.2020.

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

Ld. Addl. PP for State. sent:

Ld. Counsel for accused /applicant.

Application in hand is hereby dismissed as withdrawn a

rested by Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

State Vs Sonu alias Panchu

FIR No: 208/2018

under Section 307/506/34 IPC

PS: Subzi Mandi

04.08.2020

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

Present: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant (through V/C).

Arguments heard. Record perused.

Present application has been filed on behalf of accused/applicant named above for grant of interim bail for a period of 45 days on the basis of minutes of meeting dated 18.05.2020 of High Powered Committee.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant argued that accused/applicant was arrested on 17.07.2018 and he is in custody since then i.e. for the last more than 02 years. Accused/applicant is having absolutely clean antecedents and he is not a previous convict.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP has strongly opposed the present bail application.

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

As per report received from the concerned Jail Supdt, the conduct of the accused/applicant in jail is good and no punishment has been recorded against him.

In the report/reply sent by IO through WhatsApp, no previous conviction/involvement has been alleged against accused/applicant.

Keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances and more particularly minutes of meeting dated 18.05.2020 of High Powered Committee, accused/applicant named above is admitted to interim bail for a period of 45 days from the date of his release on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of this court. Accused/applicant shall surrender before concerned Jail Supdt on expiry of period of interim bail.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

State Vs. Javed FIR No. 140/2020 under Section 21 of NDPS Act PS Kamla Market

04.08.2020.

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

Present: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Heard. Report perused.

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

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant argued that accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no compliance of mandatory provisions of NDPS Act. Accused/applicant is having absolutely clean antecedents and he is not a previous convict. Accused/applicant is a permanent resident of Delhi and he is not likely to abscond. The quantity allegedly recovered from the possession of accused/applicant is not commercial and Bar of Section 37 of NDPS Act is not applicable in this case.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has strongly opposed the application on the ground that offence in question is of very serious nature.

I have duly considered the rival submissions. I have

Contd.....

State Vs. Javed FIR No. 140/2020

perused the record carefully.

As per prosecution case, 60 gms of Smack(Heroin) has been recovered from the possession of accused/applicant.

Though, the Bar of Section 37 of NDPS Act is not applicable in this case as the quantity of contraband allegedly recovered from the possession of accused/applicant is not commercial one, however, the accused/applicant is not entitled to claim bail as a matter of right as the quantity allegedly recovered from his possession is intermediate one and not a small quantity. As per report filed by IO, accused/applicant was previously also involved in two other cases.

Allegations against accused/applicant are of very serious nature. Accused/applicant is a habitual offender and previously also he was involved in two other cases. Investigation of the case is at very initial stages and chargesheet is yet to be filed.

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.

State Vs Okpala James

FIR No: 118/2016

under Section 21 NDPS Act & 14 Foreigner's Act

PS: Crime Branch

04.08.2020

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

Present: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant (through V/C).

Arguments heard. Record perused.

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

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant argued that accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. In the present case, there is total non compliance of Section 50 of NDPS Act and hence accused/applicant is entitled to bail at this stage and for acquittal at later stage. Accused/applicant is in custody since 2016 and trial of case is almost complete.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for the State has strongly opposed the application in hand on the ground that commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from possession of accused/applicant.

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

11/8/2020

As per prosecution case, 310 grams of cocaine (commercial quantity) was recovered from the possession of accused/applicant. Notice under Section 50 NDPS Act was duly served upon accused/applicant and at this stage, I find no inherent lacunae in the same.

As per Section 37 of NDPS Act, no accused shall be released on bail unless the court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that accused is not guilty of such offence and he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

It is reiterated that in the present case, commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the possession of accused/applicant. The accused/applicant is a foreign national and he is not having any permanent place of resident in India.

Keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances, I find no merits in the application filed by accused/applicant for grant of bail. The same is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

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

Delhi/04.08.2020

State vs. Dinesh @ Sunny @ Suresh FIR No. 272/2015 under Section 302/34 IPC PS Nabi Karim

04.08.2020.

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing).

Present: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Heard. Record perused.

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

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant argued that father as well as mother of accused/applicant are not well and there is nobody in the family of accused/applicant to look after them and hence interim bail for a period of 60 days be granted to accused/applicant.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has strongly opposed the application in hand on the ground that allegations against accused/applicant are of very serious nature and offence in question is also of heinous nature.

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

Perusal of documents annexed with the application in hand shows that the same are pertaining to the year 2012, 2015, 2016 &

Contd.....

State vs. Dinesh @ Sunny @ Suresh FIR No. 272/2015

2017. No documents of recent duration has been filed alongwith the application to show the seriousness of medical condition of father and mother of accused/applicant. As per report sent by IO through email, brother (aged about 36 years) and sister of accused/applicant are very much there to look after their parents.

Allegations against accused/applicant are of very serious nature.

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.

State Vs Wazid and anr.

IR No: 97/2019

Inder Section 392/397/411/34 IPC

S: Lahori Gate

Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

1.07.2020

resent: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Heard, Perused.

Present application has been filed on behalf of cused/applicant i.e. Wazid for early hearing of bail application.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that present plication be disposed of as not pressed.

Request is allowed.

Application in hand is hereby disposed of as not pressed

requested.

(Deepak Dabas)

ASJ/Special Judge, NDPS

(Central) Tis Hazari Courts Delhi/31.07.2020

State Vs. Fusan @ Balma & Ors. FIR No. 51/2017 under Section 302/308/323/34 IPC PS Subzi Mandi Railway Station 04.08.2020.

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

Present: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant i.e. Fusan @ Balma.

Heard. Perused.

Present application has been filed on behalf of accused/applicant named above for grant of interim bail for a period of 15 days on the ground of illness of wife of accused/applicant.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant argued that wife of accused/applicant is not well and hence interim bail for a period of 15 days be granted to accused/applicant so that he can take care of his ailing wife.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has strongly opposed the application on the ground that offence in question is of very serious nature.

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

As per prosecution version, accused/applicant alongwith co-accused persons had murdered one boy namely Deepak aged about 20 years.

Contd.....

State Vs. Fusan @ Balma & Ors. FIR No. 51/2017

Allegations against accused/applicant are of very serious nature. Statement of material witnesses/eye witnesses is yet to be recorded in Court. As per report filed by IO/SHO concerned, the wife of accused/applicant had registered/visited the hospital in question. It is further mentioned that wife of accused/applicant is living with her father aged about 55 years and mother aged about 50 years and they can take care their daughter i.e. wife 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.



State Vs Md. Raja FIR No: 26/2015

under Section 302 IPC

PS: Prasad Nagar

(Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing)

04.08,2020

Present: Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant (through V/C).

Arguments heard. Record perused.

Present application is hereby dismissed as withdrawn as

requested by Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.