

FIR No. 251/2020
Police Station : Anand Parbat
Under Section : 392/394/34 IPC
State Vs
1. Deepak
2. Praveen

26.09.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

None for complainant/applicant.

Sh Hemant Kaushik Counsel for accused.

Reply to the bail cancellation application received from the
investigating officer.

Counsel for complainant/applicant is not present. However,
counsel for accused is present.

Vakalatnama is filed on behalf of accused. It be taken on
record.

Let copy of the application be supplied to the counsel for
accused.

Put up for filing reply and arguments on 12.10.2020.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

12.00 PM- Later on learned counsel
for the applicant joined through VC.
Put up on date fixed.



FIR No. 353/2020
Police Station :Kirti Nagar
Under Section : 256/379/411/34 IPC
State Vs Kasim @ Sahil

26.09.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

Fresh third application for grant of regular bail moved on behalf of
applicant / accused Kasim @ Sahil.

Let reply of the application be called from the investigating officer
for **01.10.2020**.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

FIR No. 481/2020
Police Station : Hari Nagar
Under Section : 420 IPC and 66C/66D of IT Act
State Vs Shamshad @ Vicky

26.09.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.
Counsel for applicant/accused through video conferencing
(CISCO Webex)

This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail to the

applicant / accused Shamshad @ Vicky.

Let reply of the bail application be called from the

investigating officer for the next date.

Put up on 29.09.2020

(SAMAR VISHAL)



Addr. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi!
26.09.2020

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

26.09.2020

Present : Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for State.

Sh. Sanjeev Dwivedi Learned counsel for the applicant /
accused.

Today the matter is listed for filing reply of the anticipatory
bail application moved on behalf of applicant / accused.
No reply has been received for the last two dates of
hearing. It appears that the SHO is negligent in filing the reply in this
case. Let a report be called personally from SHO for the next date.
Put up on 30.09.2020.

(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

State Vs. Sonu
FIR No. 0837/2020
Under Section : 376 IPC/377 IPC & 6 POCSO Act
Police Station : Ranhola

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty
Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

Shri N.C Gupta, Ld. Counsel for applicant /accused.

This is an application for grant of bail to applicant/accused Sonu on the ground that accused has been wrongly implicated in the present case and has nothing to do with the alleged offence. There was love affair between the prosecutrix and applicant and prosecutrix developed physical relationship with the applicant on her own will and consent. Later on prosecutrix started demanding money from the applicant which he refused. It is stated that accused/applicant never threatened the prosecutrix, as alleged. It is also stated that applicant is of young age and is not a previous convict or habitual offender, hence it is prayed that he may be granted bail.

Reply filed.

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

As per reply, the FIR has been registered on the complaint of prosecutrix to the effect that accused/applicant raped her on the false pretext of marriage after giving her some intoxicating substance in cold drink. It is stated that ac-

Ok

State Vs. Ravi
FIR No. 800/20
Under Section : 336 IPC & 25/27/54/59 Arms Act
Police Station : Nihal Vihar

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

Shri B.L. Madhukar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

This is an application for grant of regular bail to applicant/accused Ravi. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused submitted that this regular bail application has been filed by an advocate who was not authorized by the accused or his family members and in fact he has moved an application for grant of interim bail, which is also listed for today.

Advocate, who has filed the present application is not present today.

In these circumstances, the application under consideration for grant of regular bail to applicant/accused Ravi stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

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

26.09.2020

State Vs. Sohan Sharma
FIR No. 63/20
Under Section : 354/376/506 IPC
Police Station : Ranhola

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

Shri Sanjay Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

This is an application for grant of bail to applicant/accused Sohan Sharma on the ground that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and the lodging of FIR at a belated stage clearly reflects that the entire allegations of prosecutrix are false and baseless. It is stated that no material evidence was collected by the doctor. It is also stated that this is not a case of sexual harassment but a case of taking revenge from accused to extort money from him. It is further stated that accused has clean antecedents and the his conduct in jail is satisfactory. It is prayed that accused may be granted bail.

Reply filed.

Ld. Addition Public prosecutor has opposed the bail application stating that the allegations against the accused/applicant are quite serious.

As per reply, present FIR was registered against the accused on 25.01.2020 on the complaint of prosecutrix. The investigation of the case is complete and chargesheet has been filed.

Keeping in view the fact that, investigation of the case is complete, chargesheet has been filed and accused is in judicial custody since

Ok

OK

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application stating that the allegations against the applicant are serious as the complainant sus-

State of Bihar & Anr. 2014(3)JCC 1529.

This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant/accused Prayagdeep Lakra stating *inter alia* that the applicant is innocent and victim of false implication and he never committed alleged offences. Initially the FIR was registered u/s 323/341/506/509/34 IPC which are bailable offences and later on without giving notice to the application, section 325/354/354B IPC were added. Applicant is young aged fellow and having family consisting of old aged parents, wife and two minor children. It is also stated that applicant has nothing to do with the criminal activities. 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**

Ld. Counsel for the complainant.

Shri Mahesh Kumar Patel, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

26.09.2020

State Vs. Prayagdeep Lakra
FIR No. 827/20
Under Section : 323/341/506/509/
325/354/354A/34 IPC
Police Station : Ranhola

tained grievous injuries on her legs. It is further stated that the custodial interrogation of the applicant shall be required to recover the danda which is the weapon of offence.

Ld. Counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail stating that in the case diary the reasons for arrest are not recorded by the IO till date in collusion with the accused persons. This a clear case of u/s 307 IPC and there is a threat perception by the complainant by the accused as the accused is residing next door. Further, as per statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C, proper sections have not been added till date.

On being enquired from the substitute IO, he submitted that the grounds of arrest have not been recorded till date.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, it is clear that initially the FIR was registered under the sections of IPC which are bailable. Regarding the injury to the victim, section 325 IPC is invoked which against is a bailable offence. The offence u/s 354/354-A is non-bailable. There is a history of dispute between the parties.

The applicant's counsel has relied upon the judgment of **Rajesh Dua Vs State 2017 (3) JCC 2011** submitting that the offences are punishable with sentence upto seven years and therefore, the applicant must be given notice u/s 41 -A Cr.P.C.

IO submits that the applicant is absconding. He further submits that he is not the investigating officer now and the new IO is on medical leave and will join in one or two days.

In view of afore-discussed facts and circumstances, let the applicant first join the investigation on 04.10.2020. Subsequent to his joining the investigation, in case the IO wishes to arrest him, he shall record the reasons which necessitates the arrest of the applicant.

ASHY

Put u
Till th

Put up for the consideration of bail application on 09.10.2020.

Till then, applicant shall not be arrested.

Copy of order be given Dasti and be also sent to the Investigating Offi-

cer.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

State Vs. Naresh Kumar Yadav
FIR No. 448/2019
Under Section : 33/38/58 Excise Act
Police Station : Nihal Vihar

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State.

Shri L.K Dahiya, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant /accused Naresh Kumar Yadav on the ground that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. Further, applicant has no connection with the liquor which was recovered from the main accused. It is stated that applicant has clean antecedents and he is the sole bread earner of his family. It is further stated that co-accused, who is also the main accused in the present case, has already been released on bail. Therefore, it is prayed that applicant /accused may be granted anticipatory bail.

Reply filed.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application.

As per reply of IO, as ordered by the court on 14.09.2020, applicant/accused joined the investigation and cooperated in the investigation.

There are allegations u/s 33/38/58 Excise Act against the applicant/accused. Co-accused who is stated to be main accused has already been



State Vs. Yogesh Sehrawat
FIR No. 316/20
Under Section : 376/506/34 IPC
Police Station : Mundka

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State.
Shri Ranvir Vats, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.
Shri Surender Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the complainant through Video-conferencing.

Chargesheet not received.

At request, bail application be listed on 28.09.2020.



(SAMAR VISHAL)

Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi

26.09.2020

State Vs.Sunny
FIR No. 424/2020
Under Section : 33/38/58 Excise Act
Police Station : Mundka

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State.

Shri Satish Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

This is an application for grant of bail to applicant/accused Sunny on the ground that applicant is innocent and has no concern with the alleged offence. The applicant/accused is only the owner of the vehicle used in the commission of crime. It is also stated that the co-accused namely Vipin has already been granted bail vide order dated 05.09.2020. It is prayed that since the allegations against the applicant are false, he may be granted bail.

Reply filed.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application.

As per reply, the applicant is the registered owner of scooty bearing registration no. DL 4SCJ 6526 from which the illicit liquor was being transported by the co-accused. Co-accused Vipin has already been granted bail by the Ld. MM vide order dated 05.09.2020.

Keeping in view the fact that co-accused who is the main accused, has already been granted bail, I deem it fit to grant bail to applicant/accused. **Accordingly, applicant Sunny is admitted to regular bail subject to his**



furnishing of personal bond of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of Duty Magistrate (West).

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

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



(SAMAR VISHAL)

**Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi**

26.09.2020

**Bail application No. 2075
FIR No. Not known
Police Station : Ranhola
Under Section : not known
Mayank Singh vs State**

26.09.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State.
Learned counsel for applicant / accused through video – conferencing (CISCO Webex)
Investigating Officer SI Shalini Jadon in person.

Reply of the bail application received from the investigating officer

Investigating officer submits that complaint was received against the applicant but later on the matter was settled between the parties and now the complaints have been filed and there is no FIR against the applicant in the police station Ranhola.

In these circumstances, the application become infructuous accordingly the application is dismissed.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the counsel for applicant/accused.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

State Vs. Kishore Kumar @ Ganesh
FIR No. 237/20
Under Section : 354(A)/509 IPC &
12 POCSO Act
Police Station : Anand Parbat

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

Victim in person with IO SI Sadhna.

Shri Vikash Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

This is an application for grant of bail to accused /applicant Kishore Kumar @ Ganesh.

It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused that he does not want to press the bail application and wishes to withdraw the same.

In view of the submission, the bail application of applicant/accused Kishore Kumar @ Ganesh is dismissed as withdrawn.

Application stands disposed off.

Copy of order be given Dasti.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

State Vs. Amit Yadav
FIR No. 501/20
Under Section : 363 IPC
Police Station : Hari Nagar

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.
Shri Vishnu Deo Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.
IO ASI Shiv Lal.

This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant/accused stating that applicant is having clean antecedents and have no previous criminal background and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is stated that a false complaint has been registered by the complainant against the applicant and police officials from PS Hari Nagar are regularly giving threats to applicant to arrest him. It is therefore, prayed that applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

Reply filed.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the anticipatory bail application.

As of now, there are allegations u/s 363 IPC which are bailable in nature and in case the applicant is arrested, he will be released on bail by the IO. However, IO submitted that some stringent sections may be invoked in the present case, if during investigation new facts are emerged on record.

In the given circumstances, bail application be listed on 15.10.2020.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

State Vs.Meena
FIR No. 92/2020
Under Section : 380/411/34 IPC
Police Station : Nihal Vihar

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State.
Shri Omvir Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

This is an application for grant of bail to applicant/accused Meena inter-alia on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case by the police officials of PS Nihal Vihar. It is stated that applicant is innocent and has not committed the offence alleged. It is further stated that applicant/accused is suffering from Asthma and Chest pain and getting treatment from Safdarjung hospital. Nothing has been recovered from the possession or instance of applicant. It is prayed that applicant may be released on bail.

Reply filed.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application stating that earlier bail application of applicant/accused was dismissed He also submitted that co-accused is yet to be arrested.

As per reply, there are allegations u/s 380/411/34 IPC against the applicant/accused, however no previous involvements of applicant/accused is reported by the IO.

Keeping in view the fact that applicant/accused is a lady, who is suffering from Asthma and is a first time offender, I deem it fit to grant her bail. **Ac-**



Accordingly, applicant Meena is admitted to regular bail subject to her furnishing of personal bond of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of Duty Magistrate (West).

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

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



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

26.09.2020

State Vs. Aakash
FIR No. 83/20
Under Section : 363/376/506 IPC
Police Station : Mundka

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.
Prosecutirx / victim in person.
Shri Amit Kaushal, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

This is an application for grant of bail to applicant/accused Aakash.

Reply filed.

For disposal of the bail application assistance of IO is required, who is stated to have gone to the Hon'ble High Court today.

Issue notice to the IO to appear in the court alongwith case diary, positively on the next date.

Put up on 28.09.2020.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

State Vs. Sudha
FIR No. 90/20
Under Section : 323/328/342/344/365/376/506/34 IPC
Police Station : Ranhola

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

This is a fresh application for grant of bail to accused Sudha.

Reply filed.

Since this is a bail application also for the offence punishable u/s 376 IPC, it is mandatory to issue notice to the complainant/victim. Accordingly, issue notice to the complainant/victim for the next date.

Bail application be listed on 30.09.2020.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

State Vs.Ravi
FIR No. 800/20
Under Section : 336 IPC & 25/27/54/59 Arms Act
Police Station : Nihal Vihar

26.09.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster No. 544/13639-13664 dated 29.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State.

Shri B.L Madhukar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

This is an application for grant of interim bail to applicant/accused Ravi.
Conduct report in respect of applicant/accused received from the Jail
Superintendent.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused submitted that he does not want to
press the interim bail application and wishes to withdraw the same because
the case of the applicant does not fall within the guidelines of the High Pow-
ered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

In view of submission, the application for interim bail of applicant/ac-
cused Ravi stands dismissed.

Application stands disposed off accordingly.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

FIR No. 114/2019
Police Station : Mundka
Under section : 420/406 IPC
DRA Industries Ltd vs Lalit Sharma

26.09.2020

Present :Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor
for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Applicant Mukesh Bhatia in person.

Issue notice of the application to the respondent/accused for the
next date.

Put up on **16.10.2020**.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020

**Bail application No. 2076
FIR No. Not known
Police Station : Ranhola
Under Section : not known
Sushank Singh vs State**

26.09.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State.
Learned counsel for applicant / accused through video – conferencing (CISCO Webex)
Investigating Officer SI Shalini Jadon in person.

Reply of the bail application received from the investigating officer

Investigating officer submits that complaint was received against the applicant but later on the matter was settled between the parties and now the complaints have been filed and there is no FIR against the applicant in the police station Ranhola.

In these circumstances, the application become infructuous accordingly the application is dismissed.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the counsel for applicant/accused.


(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.09.2020