FIR No.438/2020

Police Station : Tilak Nagar

State Vs.Kuldeep Singh

U/s 354/354A IPC read with section 8 POCSO Act

26.06.2020

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

This is an application for correction of FIR number in the bail order of applicant Kuldeep Singh passed by Sh. Sunil Beniwal, learned ASJ on 23.06.2020.

While hearing the bail application in FIR No. 438/2020, the learned Sessions Judge Sh Sunil Beniwal passed the bail order dated 30.06.2020 granting bail to the applicant in FIR No. 438/2020 Police Station Tilak Nagar under section 354/354A IPC and section 8 POCSO Act. However, inadvertently FIR No. In the order was written as 446/2020 instead of 438/2020.

The application is allowed and the error is rectified. In bail order dated 23.06.2020, the FIR number shall be read as 438/2020 instead of 446/2020. This order be made part of the bail order dated 23.06.2020 and a copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant's counsel.

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

Bail application No. 1272 DD No. 1

Police Station : Tilak Nagar State vs Simranjeet Singh @ Simar Under section 53/116 DP Act.

26.06.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar Singh, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).
Sh. Amit Saini, learned counsel for applicant / accused through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Rely to the bail application of applicant / accused Simranjeet Singh received.

The offence under section 53/116 DP Act is bailable in nature. Accordingly, the applicant Simranjeet Singh @ Simar is admitted on bail upon furnishing a personal bond of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction of the jail superintendent concerned.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the counsel for applicant and copy of this order be also sent to the Jail Superintendent for compliance.

(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08

West District, THC Delhi

FIR No. 424/2020

Police Station: Tilak Nagar

State Vs. Akshayjeet 2 Akshay Paul

Under Section: 376 IPC

26.06.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar Singh, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Sh.Rajeev Mohan, learned counsel for applicant / accused through

video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Complainant in person with learned counsel Sh. Abyay Gupta.

After brief arguments, it is requested by learned counsel Sh. Rajeev Mohan that a date may be given so that he may file the compilation of the judgments on which he is relying and also requested that the copy of judgments be supplied to him on which the prosecution is relying on. He also requested that complaint of extortion made by the applicant against the complainant and on record be also verified for the next date of hearing.

Request of adjournment is allowed. Let the judgments be filed by the next date of hearing and let the investigating officer also verify the complaint of the applicant made to the police station Baijnath, District Kangra, Himanchal Pradesh, which are on record in this case at page no. 15 and 17 for the next date i.e. 30.06.2020.

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

FIR No. Not known

Police Station : Rajouri Garden

State Vs.Madhu

Under Section: Not known.

26.06.2020

Present: Sh. Santosh Kumar Singh, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Sh. Ashish Raizada, learned counsel for applicant Madhu through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

This is an application for anticipatory bail of applicant / accused Madhu.

Learned APP for State submits that since the FIR has not registered, the application is not maintainable.

After hearing counsel for applicant and learned APP for State, I am of the view that the presence of investigating officer is required for consideration / disposal of this application.

Issue notice to the investigating officer to appear in person on 30.06.2020.

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

FIR No.121/2020 Police Station : Paschim Vihar East State Vs. Manmohan Juneja U/s 98A/406/34 IPC

26.06.2020

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

None for applicant / accused despite repeated calls.

Reply of anticipatory bail application received.

The applicant is not appearing for the last four dates of hearing. It appears that applicant is not interested in pursuing his application of anticipatory bail. Hence, the bail application is dismissed.

(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.06,2020

FIR No.127/2020
Police Station : Punjabi Bagh
State Vs. Ashok Kumar
and
Poonam
U/s 498A/406/34 IPC

26.06.2020

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

None for applicant / accused despite repeated calls.

Status report received from the investigating officer.

The applicant is not appearing for the last five dates of hearing. It appears that applicants are not interested in pursuing their application of anticipatory bail. Hence, the bail application is dismissed.

(SAMAR VISHAL)
Addl. Sessions Judge-08
West District, THC Delhi
26.06.2020

FIR No. 183/2020

Police Station: Paschim Vihar

State Vs. Amit Kumar

U/s 376/328/366 IPC

26.06.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster no. /Misc./Gaz./DJ/West/2020 dated 14.06.2020.

Present:

Sh. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor

for State through video-conferencing (CISCO Webex).

Shri P.K Garg, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Ld. Counsel for the complainant.

This is an application for grant of regular bail to accused applicant Amit Kumar on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is in judicial custody since 19.05.2020. The other co-accused except accused Akash have been admitted on anticipatory bail. It is prayed that since accused is innocent and has never involved in any other criminal case, he may be admitted on bail.

Reply to the bail application has been filed.

Ld. Counsel for accused/ applicant has filed on record marriage photographs of accused and the complainant.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application stating that the allegations against the accused are serious and he may threaten the complainant, if released on bail.

Ld. Counsel for the complainant has also vehemently opposed the bail application.

As per record, FIR in the present case has been lodged on the complaint of Ms. Ritu, who made specific allegations of rape against the applicant/accused.

Further, the first bail application of accused was dismissed by Shri Sunil Beniwal, Ld. ASJ vide order dated 30.05.2020 while the second bail application was dismissed by Shri Manish Gupta, Ld. ASJ vide order dated 11.06.2020. Thus, accused has moved three application including the present one within such a short span of time. However, no new ground has emerged on record after the dismissal of first bail application of accused.

Keeping in view the fact that the allegations against the accused are grave in nature and the fact that there are no change in circumstances after dismissal of bail order on 11.06.2020 and there is no fresh ground for grant of bail to accused, I do not deem it fit to admit accused on bail. Accordingly, the bail application of accused Amit Kumar stands dismissed.

Bail application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of order be given Dasti.

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

Bail Application no. 886/2020 FIR No. 1036/2006

Police Station: Rajouri Garden

State Vs. Sonu U/s 326/34 IPC

26.06.2020

The Court of undersigned is having duty today as per Circular / Duty Roster no. /Misc./Gaz./DJ/West/2020 dated 14.06.2020.

Present:

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

Shri Ziya Afroz, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

This is an application for grant of bail to accused Sonu.

Perusal of bail application shows that there are allegations u/s 326 IPC against the accused, which is triable by the Ld. Metropolitan Magistrate.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for accused submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the bail application with liberty to move the same before the Ld. Magistrate.

In view of the submission, the bail application of accused Sonu is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to move the same afresh before the concerned Ld. Magistrate.

Application stands disposed off accordingly.

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