Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused through CISCO Webex.

IO through CISCO Webex.

None for complainant.

It is stated by the Ld. Counsel that co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 28.02.2020. He also drew the attention of the court towards the order dated 28.02.2020 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. He stated that the present accused is also willing to settle the matter with the complainant. In view of the same, he prayed that accused be admitted to bail on the ground of parity for the period of six months.

Heard.

Put up the application for further arguments on 19.05.2020.

IO is directed to inform the complainant about the bail application and to join the proceedings through CISCO Webex via meeting no.574 854 284 on 19.05.2020 at 03:00 pm.

State vs. Uday Singh Bagga

FIR No.624/15 & 292/17 PS Ranjit Nagar

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for accused through CISCO Webex.

IO through CISCO Webex.

None for complainant.

It is stated by the Ld. Counsel that co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 28.02.2020. He also drew the attention of the court towards the order dated 28.02.2020 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. He stated that the present accused is also willing to settle the matter with the complainant. In view of the same, he prayed that accused be admitted to bail on the ground of parity for the period of six months.

Heard.

Put up the application for further arguments on 19.05.2020.

IO is directed to inform the complainant about the bail application and to join the proceedings through CISCO Webex via meeting no.574 854 284 on 19.05.2020 at 03:00 pm.

(Babita Puniya) Duty MM/West/THC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no.DL3C-CH-1924** on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **vehicle bearing no.DL3C-CH-1924** is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no.DL3C-CH-1924 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle bearing no.DL3C-CH-1924 be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the **vehicle bearing no.DL3C-CH-1924** should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy dasti.

FIR No.180/20 PS Hari Nagar U/s 188 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Applicant in person.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of e-battery rickshaw on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **e-battery rickshaw** is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. e-battery rickshaw can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let e-battery rickshaw be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the **e-battery rickshaw** should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

FIR No. 59/2020

PS: Mayapuri

09.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for the State.

None for accused.

Put up on 18.05.2020 for purpose fixed.

(RINKU JAIN)
DUTY MM/WEST/DELHI
09.05.2020

18/s/n Boll varification, report policed.

If a reinfication, what policed.

Of a cursord be released.

Of a cursord be released.

Of a cursord be released.

Of any other com.

Scanned by CamScanner

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

None on behalf of applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no.DL9C-AR-6877** on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **vehicle bearing no.DL9C-AR-**6877 is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no.DL9C-AR-6877 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle bearing no.DL9C-AR-6877 be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the **vehicle bearing no.DL9C-AR-6877** should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

FIR No.101/20 PS Patel Nagar U/s 188 IPC and Section 3 PD Act

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

None on behalf of applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of vehicle bearing no.DL2C-AN-3412 on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **vehicle bearing no.DL2C-AN-** 3412 is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no.DL2C-AN-3412 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle bearing no.DL2C-AN-3412 be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the **vehicle bearing no.DL2C-AN-3412** should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

State vs. Vipin Kumar

FIR No.520/2020 PS Paschim Vihar West U/s 188 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no.DL9-ER-8104 (E-Rickshaw)** on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **vehicle bearing no.DL9-ER-8104 (E-Rickshaw)** is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no.DL9-ER-8104 (E-Rickshaw) can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle bearing no.DL9-ER-8104 (E-Rickshaw) be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the vehicle bearing no.DL9-ER-8104 (E-Rickshaw) should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

This is an application filed by Dy. Superintendent seeking clarification/status in r/o UTP Gaurav S/o Sh. Yadram.

It is stated in the application that accused was ordered to be released by the court concerned on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction of Jail Superintendent.

It is further stated in the application that pursuant to the direction passed by the Ld. Court, the address verification report was called, however, the address could not be verified due to incomplete address. Alongwith the application, the Dy. Superintendent has also enclosed the address verification report forwarded by the DCP concerned.

I have perused the address verification report which was forwarded by the SHO and DCP concerned wherein it is stated that "address verify शुदा है"

In view of the above, let report be called from the Jail Superintendent for 19.05.2020.

FIR No.178/2020 PS Rajouri Garden U/s 379/411/34 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

None for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused **Babbal Rathore** under section 437 CrPC seeking regular bail. Reply is already on record.

Application and reply perused.

Perusal of documents reveal that accused is running in JC since 13.03.2020 and recovery has already been effected. Therefore, I deem it fit to admit the accused **Babbal Rathore** on bail on his furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one sound surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Ld. Duty MM/concerned court/Jail Superintendent on the following conditions:

- 1. That the accused shall co-operate in the investigation; and
- 2. That the accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement or threat to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer; and
- 3. That the accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspect; and
- 4. That he shall not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse the liberty; and
- 5. That he shall not change his residence without prior permission of this Court; and
- 6. After filing of charge sheet in the court, the accused shall remain present before the court on each and every date fixed for hearing of the case. If he wants to remain absent, then he shall take prior permission of the court and in case of unavoidable circumstances for remaining absent, he shall immediately give intimation to the court and request that he may be permitted to be represented through counsel and he will not dispute the identity of the accused in the case.

It is made clear that if the accused/applicant commits breach of any of the above conditions, the bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled.

Any observation made herein shall have no bearing on the merits of

the case.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for compliance/information.

Copy dasti.

State vs. Ram Mahto

FIR No.241/2020 PS Mundka U/s 33/38/58 Delhi Excise Act

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

None for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Ram Mahto under section 437 CrPC seeking regular bail. Reply is already on record.

Application and reply perused.

Perusal of documents reveal that accused is running in JC since 19.04.2020 and recovery has already been effected. Therefore, I deem it fit to admit the accused **Ram Mahto** on bail on his furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one sound surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Ld. Duty MM/concerned court/Jail Superintendent on the following conditions:-

- 1. That the accused shall co-operate in the investigation; and
- 2. That the accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement or threat to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as 2 to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer; and
- 3. That the accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspect; and
- 4. That he shall not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse the liberty; and
- 5. That he shall not change his residence without prior permission of this Court; and
- 6. After filing of charge sheet in the court, the accused shall remain present before the court on each and every date fixed for hearing of the case. If he wants to remain absent, then he shall take prior permission of the court and in case of unavoidable circumstances for remaining absent, he shall immediately give intimation to the court and request that he may be permitted to be represented through counsel and he will not dispute the identity of the accused in the case.

It is made clear that if the accused/applicant commits breach of any of the above conditions, the bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled.

Any observation made herein shall have no bearing on the merits of

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for

compliance/information.

case.

Copy dasti.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no.UP15-ET-0691** on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **vehicle bearing no.UP15-ET-**0691 is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no.UP15-ET-0691 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle bearing no.UP15-ET-0691 be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the **vehicle bearing no.UP15-ET-0691** should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy dasti.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of vehicle bearing no.DL1CR-0492 on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **vehicle bearing no.DL1CR-**0492 is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no.DL1CR-0492 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle bearing no.DL1CR-0492 be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the **vehicle bearing no.DL1CR-0492** should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

(Babita Purtiya) Duty MM/West/THC 18.05.2020 2

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused **Shaukin** under section 437 CrPC seeking regular bail.

It is submitted by the learned counsel that a false case has been foisted upon the accused; running in J/C since 22.01.2020 and prayed that accused may be released on bail.

Per contra, bail application is strongly opposed by the learned APP for the State.

I have heard the arguments and perused the police file.

Considering the overall conspectus of the case, particularly the custody period of accused, I deem it fit to admit the accused **Shaukin** on bail on his furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one sound surety in the like amount on the conditions:-

- 1. That the accused shall co-operate in the investigation; and
- 2. That the accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement or threat to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer; and
- 3. That the accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspect; and
- 4. That he shall not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse the liberty; and
- 5. That he shall not change his residence without prior permission of this Court; and
- 6. After filing of charge sheet in the court, the accused shall remain present before the court on each and every date fixed for hearing of the case. If he wants to remain absent, then he shall take prior permission of the court and in case of unavoidable circumstances for remaining absent, he shall immediately give intimation to the court and request that he may be permitted to be represented through counsel and he will not dispute the identity of the accused in the case.

It is made clear that if the accused/applicant commits breach of any of the above conditions, the bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled.

Any observation made herein shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for compliance/information.

Copy dasti.

FIR No.364/2020 PS Hari Nagar U/s 188/269/270/34 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

None on behalf of applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no.RJ14-GJ-3765 & RJ52-GA-5665** on Superdari.

Heard. Reply perused.

As per reply, IO has no objection, if the **vehicle bearing no.RJ14-GJ-** 3765 & **RJ52-GA-5665** is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no.RJ14-GJ-3765 & RJ52-GA-5665 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle bearing no.RJ14-GJ-3765 & RJ52-GA-5665 be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the **vehicle bearing no.RJ14-GJ-3765 & RJ52-** GA-5665 should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

The application stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

(Babita Puniya)
Duty MM/West/THC

18.05.2020

State vs. Chandan Chaudhary

FIR No.126/2020 PS Rajouri Garden U/s 33/38/58 Delhi Excise Act

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

None for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused **Chandan Chaudhary** under section 437 CrPC seeking regular bail. Reply is already on record.

Application and reply perused.

Perusal of documents reveal that accused is running in JC since 09.02.2020 and recovery has already been effected. Therefore, I deem it fit to admit the accused **Chandan Chaudhary** on bail on his furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one sound surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Ld. Duty MM/concerned court/Jail Superintendent on the following conditions:-

- 1. That the accused shall co-operate in the investigation; and
- 2. That the accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement or threat to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer; and
- 3. That the accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspect; and
- 4. That he shall not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse the liberty; and
- 5. That he shall not change his residence without prior permission of this Court; and
- 6. After filing of charge sheet in the court, the accused shall remain present before the court on each and every date fixed for hearing of the case. If he wants to remain absent, then he shall take prior permission of the court and in case of unavoidable circumstances for remaining absent, he shall immediately give intimation to the court and request that he may be permitted to be represented through counsel and he will not dispute the identity of the accused in the case.

It is made clear that if the accused/applicant commits breach of any of the above conditions, the bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled.

Any observation made herein shall have no bearing on the merits of

me case.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for compliance/information.

Copy dasti.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

None for accused.

This is an application filed on behalf of accused seeking status report from the Jail Superintendent.

Documents perused.

Perusal of documents reveals that bail bond was accepted by the Ld. Duty MM on 08.05.2019, however, the accused is still running in JC. Therefore, let report be called from the Jail Superintendent on the following point:-

1. When the release warrants were received by the Jail Superintendent in case FIR No.228/19 and 427/19 both registered at PS Mundka.

Put up on 19.05.2020.

State vs. Suraj @ Dada

FIR No.035774/19 PS Mayapuri U/s 379/411 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Sh. Vaibhav Kumar, Ld. Counsel for accused.

Court is convened through video conferencing.

This is an application seeking regular bail of accused **Suraj** @ **Dada**. Reply is already on record.

During the course of arguments, it is stated by the Ld. Counsel that accused is running in JC since 23.12.2019 and recovery has already been effected.

He further stated that due to Covid-19 pandemic, he is unable to furnish the surety bond. He, therefore, prayed that instead of granting the regular bail, he may be released on interim bail for 45 days as directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Supreme Court of India.

Bail application is opposed by the Ld. APP for State.

Perusal of the reply reveals that accused was formally arrested by the IO with the permission of court. Further, reply reveals that charge-sheet has already been filed before the court. Therefore, taking into consideration the custody period and the present situation, I deem it fit to admit the accused **Suraj** @ **Dada** on interim bail for a period of 45 days on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Superintendent.

He shall surrender before the Jail Superintendent on the expiry of 45 days.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for compliance/information.

Copy dasti.

(Babita Puniya)

Duty MM/West/THC

18.05.2020

18.05,2020

'esent: Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

This an application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Sanjay Chandra under section 437 CrPC seeking regular bail.

After some arguments, Ld. Counsel wishes to withdraw the bail application.

Heard. Allowed.

Accordingly, application stands dismissed as withdrayn.

Copy dasti.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Sh. Vinay Jadka, Ld. Counsel for applicant through video call.

None on behalf of non-applicant.

Court is convened through video conferencing/CISCO Webex Meet.

Reply filed by the non-applicant, however, none has appeared on behalf of the non-applicant nor joined the proceedings through Webex Meet.

Since none has joined the proceedings on behalf of the non-applicant, let fresh court notice be issued to the non-applicant to join the proceedings tomorrow through Webex Meet at 02:00 pm.

At this stage, it is informed by the Reader of the court that he has telephonically informed the mother of the non-applicant about the court hearing on her mobile number i.e. 9911411414 as well as her Advocate namely Sh. Sparsh Chaudhary on his mobile number i.e. 9910974494.

Put up on 19.05.2020 at 02:00 pm.

Order be communicated to both the parties through whatsapp.

Fresh challan filed. It be checked and registered as per rules.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

IO in person.

Accused persons are POs.

Heard. File perused.

Put up for consideration on 14.09.2020.

Fresh challan filed. It be checked and registered as per rules.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

IO in person.

Accused is stated to be on police bail.

Heard. File perused.

Put up for consideration on 14.09.2020.

State vs. Md. Dilshad

FIR No.79/2020 PS Mundka U/s 379/411/34 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Heard. Application perused.

Perusal of application reveals that Jail Superintendent has not forwarded the bail application, moved by the accused. Therefore, he is directed to forward the bail application by the next date of hearing.

Put up on 21.05.2020.

(Babita Puniya) / Duty MM/West/THC

18.05.2020

State vs. Haripal & Ajay Tripathi @ Monu

FIR No.90/20 PS Hari Nagar U/s 364A/392/34 IPC

18.05.2020

Fresh challan filed. It be checked and registered as per rules.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

IO in person.

Accused persons are stated to be in JC.

I have perused the charge sheet and the documents annexed with the charge-sheet. It prima facie discloses commission of offence. I take cognizance of the offence.

I am of the considered opinion that there is prima facie sufficient material to proceed against the accused persons for the offences alleged in the challan.

IO is directed to file e-challan alongwith # value certificate by the next date of hearing.

Let production warrants of accused persons be issued for the next date of hearing.

Put up on 01.06.2020.

State vs. Javed Ali & Ors.

FIR No.00079/20 PS Mundka U/s 379/411/34 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Accused persons are stated to be in JC (not produced from JC on account of Covid-19 pandemic).

I have perused the charge sheet and the documents annexed with the charge-sheet. It prima facie discloses commission of offence. I take cognizance of the offence.

I am of the considered opinion that there is prima facie sufficient material to proceed against the accused persons for the offences alleged in the challan.

Let production warrants of accused persons be issued for the next date of hearing.

Put up on 01.06.2020.

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Accused is stated to be in JC (not produced from JC on account of

Covid-19 pandemic).

I have perused the charge sheet and the documents annexed with the charge-sheet. It prima facie discloses commission of offence. I take cognizance of the offence.

I am of the considered opinion that there is prima facie sufficient material to proceed against the accused for the offences alleged in the challan.

Let production warrants of accused be issued for the next date of hearing.

Put up on 01.06.2020 before court concerned,

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Accused is stated to be in JC (not produced from JC on account of

Covid-19 pandemic).

I have perused the charge sheet and the documents annexed with the charge-sheet. It prima facie discloses commission of offence. I take cognizance of the offence.

I am of the considered opinion that there is prima facie sufficient material to proceed against the accused for the offences alleged in the challan.

Let production warrants of accused be issued for the next date of hearing.

Put up on 01.06.2020.

State vs. Harish

FIR No.356/19 PS Mundka U/s 302/506/201/120B/34 IPC & U/s 27/54/59 Arms Act

18.05.2020

Present: Ld. APP for State.

Heard. File perused.

IO has not filed e-challan.

Let same be filed by the next date of hearing.

Put up for further proceedings on 01.06.2020.

State vs. Harish Tiwari

FIR No.495/17 PS Punjabi Bagh U/s 384/389/120B/34 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Applicant/accused in person.

This is an application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Harish Tiwari seeking extension to interim bail for a period of two months to look after his ailing wife and to take care of his family in covid-19 pandemic situation.

It is stated by the applicant that earlier also his interim bail was granted by the Ld. Duty MM vide order dated 01.04.2020. He further stated that he has not misused liberty granted by the Ld. Duty MM. He, therefore, requested his bail application may be accepted keeping in view of present situation.

Application is not opposed by the Ld. APP for State.

In view of the outbreak of covid-19 pandemic and keeping in view the fact that accused has not misused liberty granted by the Ld. Duty MM, I deem it fit to extend the interim bail for a period of 45 days from today i.e. 18.05.2020 on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/- on the same conditions as imposed by Ld. Duty MM vide order dated 01.04.2020. He is directed to surrender before the Jail Superintendent after the expiry of 45 days i.e. 02.07.2020.

Bail bond furnished. Perused and accepted for 45 days.

Order be communicated to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for information and compliance.

Copy dasti.

State vs. Virat @ Raja @ Cheera & Ors.

FIR No.117/19 PS Hari Nagar U/s 302/341/34 IPC U/s 25/27 Arms Act

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Accused persons are stated to be in JC (not produced from JC on

account of Covid-19 pandemic).

Heard. File perused.

Let production warrants of accused persons be issued for the next date

of hearing.

Put up for consideration on 01.06.2020.

FIR No.177/20 PS Patel Nagar U/s 356/379/411/34 IPC

18.05.2020

present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Sandeep @ Deep under section 437 CrPC seeking regular bail.

It is submitted by the learned counsel that a false case has been foisted upon the accused; running in J/C since 23.04.2020 and prayed that accused may be released on bail.

Per contra, bail application is strongly opposed by the learned APP for the State.

I have heard the arguments and perused the police file.

Considering the overall conspectus of the case, particularly the custody period of accused, I deem it fit to admit the accused **Sandeep** @ **Deep** on bail on his furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one sound surety in the like amount on the conditions:-

- 1. That the accused shall co-operate in the investigation; and
- 2. That the accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement or threat to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer; and
- 3. That the accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspect; and
- 4. That he shall not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse the liberty; and
- 5. That he shall not change his residence without prior permission of this Court; and
- 6. After filing of charge sheet in the court, the accused shall remain present before the court on each and every date fixed for hearing of the case. If he wants to remain absent, then he shall take prior permission of the court and in case of unavoidable circumstances for remaining absent, he shall immediately give intimation to the court and request that he may be permitted to be represented

(/ Scanned by CamScanner

12

counsel and he will not dispute the identity of the accused in the case.

It is made clear that if the accused/applicant commits breach of of the above conditions, the bail granted to him shall be liable to e cancelled.

Any observation made herein shall have no bearing on the merits of

the case.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for compliance/information.

Copy dasti.

State vs. Raghubir & Ors.

FIR No.98/15 PS Ranhola U/s 323/341/325/427/506/34 IPC

18.05.2020

Present:

Ld. APP for State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused **Raghubir** under section 437 CrPC seeking interim bail.

It is submitted by the learned counsel that accused was on police bail as all the offences alleged against him were bailable in nature, however, later on he was declared proclaimed offender by the court concerned. Hence, the present bail application. He further stated that accused is running in J/C since 04.02.2020 and prayed that accused may be released on bail.

Per contra, bail application is strongly opposed by the learned APP for the State.

I have heard the arguments and perused the police file.

Considering the overall conspectus of the case, particularly the custody period of accused, I deem it fit to admit the accused **Raghubir** on interim bail on his furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one sound surety in the like amount on the conditions:-

- 1. That the accused shall co-operate in the investigation; and
- 2. That the accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement or threat to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer; and
- 3. That the accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspect; and
- 4. That he shall not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse the liberty; and
- 5. That he shall not change his residence without prior permission of this Court; and
- 6. After filing of charge sheet in the court, the accused shall remain present before the court on each and every date fixed for hearing of the case. If he wants to remain absent, then he shall take prior permission of the court and in case of unavoidable circumstances for remaining absent, he shall immediately give



to the court and request that he may be permitted to be represented the counsel and he will not dispute the identity of the accused in the case.

It is made clear that if the accused/applicant commits breach of any of the above conditions, the bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled.

Any observation made herein shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent, Tihar Jail for compliance/information.

Copy dasti.