Bail Appl. No. 1399 FIR No. 753/20 PS: Nangloi State Vs. Rajan@Shyam@Shama U/s 308 IPC

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty Roster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is the application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Rajan @ Shyam @Shama.

Present: Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

10 SI Rohit.

Sh. Ajay Uppal, Ld Counsel for the

applicant/accused.

Reply to the application filed. Copy given.

I have heard arguments from both the sides and perused the reply.

It is argued on behalf of applicant that he is in J.C since 30.06.2020. It is further argued that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case by the police. It is further argued that on the date of incident i.e 29.06.2020, applicant went to purchase pan bahar from the shop of the

complainant but instead of giving him pan bahar, he gave him a pan to which the applicant told the complainant that he never asked for the pan. On this, complainant, who himself was under the influence of liquor came out from his shop to ask for the price of pan and during this process, he fell on his own and got the injuries and thereafter, in order to falsely implicate the applicant and in order to get compensation from the applicant, got himself admitted in the hospital. The allegations in the FIR are totally false and fabricated. Therefore, it is prayed that applicant may be granted bail and he is ready to abide by any condition imposed by this court.

Per contra, Ld. State Counsel has opposed the bail application on the ground that as per reply of the IO, injured is still hospitalized and that the injuries sustained by the injured cannot be received by falling. It is further argued that the opinion on the nature of injuries has not been received from the doctor yet.

I have considered rival arguments.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that matter is still at the stage of investigation, no ground is made out for grant of bail to the applicant/accused at this stage. Application is accordingly dismissed.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

FIR No. 14502/20

PS: Nangloi

State Vs. Kapil Sharma

U/s 379 IPC

18.07.2020

Through Video Conferencing

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty Roster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is the application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Kapil Sharma.

Present: Sh. Manoj Garg, Ld. Sub. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Prateek Mehta, Ld Counsel for the

applicant/accused Kapil Sharma through V.C.

Fresh reply to the application filed.

I have heard arguments from both the sides through video conferencing and perused the reply.

As per the reply received from the IO, since the recovery has already been effected, applicant is not required for the purpose of any interrogation. \bigcap_{IA}

In view of the reply, since applicant is not required for any custodial interrogation, applicant is granted anticipatory bail. SHO PS Nangloi is directed that in the event of his arrest, he be released on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- with one surety in the like amount.

Dasti copy be given.

FIR No.425/20 PS :Paschim Vihar State Vs. Akash Yadav U/s. 302/307/201/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act.

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty roaster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

<u>Proceedings of this matter has been conducted through Video</u> <u>Conferencing</u>

Present:

Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for the state.

Sh. J.K. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused seeks to withdraw the present application. Heard. Allowed.

At the request of Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.

FIR No.386/2018 PS :Patel Nagar State Vs. Subhash U/s. 420/468/471/120B/34 IPC

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty roaster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

Proceedings of this matter has been conducted through Video Conferencing

This is an application U/s. 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Subhash.

Present:

Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for the state.

Ms. Archana Verma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused seeks adjournment as she is out of station. Heard. Allowed.

Put up for hearing on the present bail application on 21.07.2020.

FIR No.157/2019

PS:Nangloi

State Vs. Md. Sanaullah

U/s. 376/323/354/354A/506/509/34 IPC & 4/8/12 of POCSO Act.

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty roaster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is an application U/s. 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Md. Sanaullah.

Present:

Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for the state.

Sh. Pankaj Rehani, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

IO/SI Rohit in person.

IO filed reply. Copy supplied to Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld. State Counsel submits that as per mandate of law presence of prosecutrix/complainant is must in this case.

At the request of Ld. State Counsel, let the notice be issued to complainant to be served through IO to appear on next date.

Put up for presence of complainant and hearing arguments on the bail application on 24.07.2020.

FIR No.454/20

PS:Tilak Nagar

State Vs. Arun

U/s. 457/380/411/34 IPC

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty roaster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is an application U/s. 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Arun.

Present:

Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for the state.

Sh. Mahesh Patel, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Complainant in person.

IO/HC Gurjeet Singh in person.

It is submitted that qua present accused only allegation of section 411 IPC is made out and matter has been compromised.

Complainant and Ld. Counsel for accused both have sought 2-3 days time to make the payment in view of the interim protection mentioned with the direction that IO shall not arrest the accused till next date.

Put up for payment and hearing of arguments on bail application on 25.07.2020.

Copy of this order be given dasti, as prayed,

FIR No.635/20 PS :Rajouri Garden State Vs. Chinju U/s. 380/454/34 IPC

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty roaster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is an application U/s. 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Chinju.

Present:

Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for the state.

Sh. R.K. Giri, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply of IO received. Copy supplied to Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Part arguments heard.

During the course of arguments Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused submits that earlier applicant/accused was declared as BC of the area by police and now he has informed but police did not give him a chance to reform and falsely implicated the accused in the present case. It is also submitted by Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused that the allegation in the reply are false and vague. Accused was not present at his house when the police officials visited there.

Contd.../-

At this stage, Ld. State Counsel submits that let IO be called alongwith paper book to apprise the court whether the case property has been recovered or not and also furnish the record of previous involvement.

Let IO be called for next date with paper book and record of previous involvement.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused request to stay the arrest.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, IO is directed not to arrest the accused till next date.

Put up for appearance of IO alongwith paper book and record of previous involvement and hearing of the bail application on 23.07.2020.

Copy of this order be given dasti to both the parties, as prayed.

FIR No.642/20 PS :Punjabi Bagh State Vs. Ashwani Nirala U/s. 376(2)(n)/313 IPC

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty roaster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

<u>Proceedings of this matter has been conducted through Video</u> <u>Conferencing</u>

This is an application U/s. 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Ashwani Nirala.

Present:

Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for the state.

Sh. M.P. Sinha, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Prosecutrix/complainant in person.

IO filed reply. Same is taken on record.

Ld. State Counsel requests that direction be issued to supply one set of hard copy of written submissions filed by Ld. Counsel for accused as written submissions are bulky.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for accused agreed to supply one set of hard copy in the court.

Ld. State Counsel requests to call IO on next date to assist him.

Contd.../-

Bail Appl. No. 1350 FIR No. 322/20 PS: Tilak Nagar State Vs.Karan U/s 394/397/411/34 IPC

18.07.2020

Through Video Conferencing

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty Roster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is the application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Karan.

Present: Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

IO SI Rohit.

Sh. Sushant Yogi, Ld Counsel for the applicant/accused through V.C..

I have heard arguments from both the sides and perused the reply.

It is argued on behalf of applicant that he is in J.C since 25.04.2020. It is further argued that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case by the police. It is further argued that investigation has been completed and applicant is no more required for any

Per contra, Ld. State Counsel has opposed the bail application on the ground that the robbed amount of Rs. 2100/- was recovered from the possession of applicant. It is further argued that applicant refused to get his TIP conducted.

I have considered rival arguments.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the serious allegations against the applicant and that matter is still at the stage of investigation, no ground is made out for grant of bail to the applicant/accused at this stage. Application is accordingly dismissed.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

(POORAN CHAND) ASJ-02/West/Delhi 18.07.2020 e

Bail Appl. No. 1340 FIR No. 554/20 PS: Rajouri Garden State Vs. Suraj U/s 376/506/328 IPC

18.07.2020

The undersigned is performing duty pursuant to the computer generated circular/duty Roster dated 15.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is the application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant Suraj.

Present: Sh. Rajat Kalra, Ld. Addl. PP for State. IO WSI Babita.
Sh. Mayank Punia, Ld Counsel for the applicant/accused.

Reply to the application already filed. Copy given to the Ld. Counsel for applicant.

I have heard arguments from both the sides and perused the reply.

It is argued on behalf of applicant that he is in J.C since 15.06.2020. It is further argued that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case on the false and frivolous allegations. Ld. Counsel for applicant while relying on the photographs and chats exchanged between

the applicant and victim annexed with the application, has argued that the physical relations made between the applicant and victim were out of mutual consent and victim was under no threat or force by the applicant to make physical relations. The allegations in the FIR are totally false and fabricated. It is also argued that applicant never made physical relations with the victim on the pretext of marriage. Therefore, it is prayed that applicant may be granted bail and he is ready to abide by any condition imposed by this court.

Per contra, Ld. State Counsel has opposed the bail application. While relying on the statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C of the victim, he has argued that the applicant obtained the consent of the victim by mis-representation. It is also argued that applicant continued to make physical relations with the victim on the pretext of marriage.

I have considered rival arguments.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the serious allegations against the applicant, no ground is made out for grant of bail to the applicant/accused at this stage. Application is accordingly dismissed.

Copy of this order be given dasti.