Bail Application No.: 1983

Vicky Vs. State

FIR No. : 602/2020 PS : Ranhola

U/s : 307/34 IPC

08.09.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. S. K. Rajput, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused.

Ld. Counsel for the accused request for adjournment. Request for adjournment is declined. Arguments heard. Ld. Counsel for the accused request that he may be permitted to withdraw the bail application. The request to withdraw bail application is also declined.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)

ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01 West, THC, Delhi/08.09.2020

12:40 PM

By this order I shall decide the bail application of accused Vicky. The brief facts of the case are that complaint was given by Kapil, that on 25.05.2020 there was a verbal altercation between the applicant accused upon which Vicky had slapped the complainant.

On 27.05.2020, complainant had called Vicky near Grover Hotel Nangli Vihar at around 9 PM Vicky along with his

brother Ramu came and started abusing his friend Amit. Instead of resolving the matter Vicky, who was carrying a knife attacked the complainant and when his friend Amit tried to save him Vicky also stabbed him in his stomach. The complainant was stabbed in chest and thigh. The accused ran away from the spot. The above FIR was registered.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued that instead of knife scissor has been recovered, the accused is in judicial custody since 28.05.2020. Co-accused has been granted bail by the Ld. MM Court.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for the State submits that allegations against the accused are serious in nature. The role of co-accused and the present accused was different in nature and applicant does not deserve grant of bail.

I have heard Ld. Addl. P. P. for State and Ld. Counsel for accused and perused the record.

The charge sheet has been filed, however, the case is yet to be committed. In so far as the bail on the ground of parity has been sought the role of present applicant is different from the other co-accused i.e. Ramu Yadav. There are specific allegations that it was the present applicant who had stabbed the complainant as well as his friend Amit. Thus, I do not find any ground to grant bail to the present accused. Application for bail stands dismissed.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01

Bail Application No.: 1986 Jindal Kumar Vs. State FIR No.: 812/2020

PS : Nihal Vihar U/s : 323/354/354B/411/34B IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

08.09.2020

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. M. K. Gahlot, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

ASI Padam Singh in person.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01

West, THC, Delhi/08.09.2020

1:20 PM

- 1. By this application I shall decide the anticipatory bail application of accused Jindal Kumar.
- 2. The brief facts of the case are that on 08.08.2020 at around 8 PM, accused Vijay came in a drunken state and started abusing the complainant and also gave beatings to her

husband when she tried to save her husband accused pushed her and also put a hand on her chest. The complainant asked her husband to leave. In the meantime, wife of accused came and she also started abusing the complainant. A call at 100 number was made. PCR officials were called at the spot and both of them were being taken to PS. While in the PCR accused Vijay tried to touch the private parts of the complainant which fact was brought to the notice of the PCR officials who got the seat changed. On these allegations above said FIR was registered. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused has argued that it was a dispute between the neighbours where he was also beaten and in fact a complaint was given by him on which an FIR has been registered U/s 323/341/34 IPC. It is argued that accused should be granted anticipatory bail as the present FIR is a counter blast to the complaint made by the present applicant.

- 3. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has submitted that submitted that this is 2nd anticipatory bail application and as such there is no change in circumstances.
- 4. I have heard Ld. Addl. P. P. for State and Ld. Counsel for accused and perused the record.
- 5. The first anticipatory bail application was dismissed on 02.09.2020. I do not find any change in circumstances the allegations against the accused are serious in nature. It is specifically alleged that accused has tried to touch the private

parts of the victim while sitting in the PCR van which shows that applicant has no regard to the law or police official. Accordingly anticipatory bail application is dismissed. Copy of order be sent to all concerned through electronic mode.

Bail Application No. : 1982 Rajat Verma Vs. State

FIR No.

: 506/2020

PS

: Hari Nagar

U/s

: 376/354/354(B)/451/ 341/

380/506/509/34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

08.09.2020

Fresh Bail application filed and taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ BailPower/ Gaz./ DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ms. Arti Pandey, Ld. DCW Counsel.

Mr. Ajay Verma, Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused.

Reply on behalf of IO filed. Copies be sent to the Ld. counsel for accused through electronic mode.

Let notice be issued to complainant in terms of practice directions of Hon'ble Delhi High Court through IO.

Put up for arguments on 11.09.2020 through VC.

(ANKUR JAIN)

Bail Application No.: 1985 Simran Kaur Vs. State FIR No.: 594/2020

FIR No.

: Nihal Vihar

U/s

: 498A/304B/34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco Web Ex,

08.09.2020

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State .

Mr. Zia Afroz, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused.

IO in person.

Report filed by IO. After hearing arguments it transpires that charge sheet has been filed by the prosecution and in the said charge sheet accused has not been arrested. Ld. Counsel for accused seeks liberty to withdraw the present bail application.

Be awaited.

(ANKUR JAIN)

ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01 West, THC, Delhi/08.09.2020

At 11:50 AM

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State .

Mr. Akhil Tarun Goel, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused (Physically appeared in Court).

IO in person.

Statement of the Ld. Counsel for the accused is recorded separately. In view of the statement the present bail application is

dismissed as withdrawn. Copy of order be given Dasti to the Ld. Counsel for accused.

Bail Application No.: 1984 Dhanwanti Kaur Vs. State

FIR No. : 594/2020 PS : Nihal Vihar

U/s : 498A/304B/34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco Web Ex,

08.09.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Zia Afroz, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused.

IO in person.

Report filed by IO. After hearing arguments it transpires that charge sheet has been filed by the prosecution and in the said charge sheet accused has not been arrested. Ld. Counsel for accused seeks liberty to withdraw the present bail application.

Be awaited.

(ANKUR JAIN)

ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01 West, THC, Delhi/08.09.2020

At 11:50 AM

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Akhil Tarun Goel, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused (Physically appeared in Court).

IO in person.

Statement of the Ld. Counsel for the accused is recorded separately. In view of the statement the present bail application is

dismissed as withdrawn. Copy of order be given Dasti to the Ld. Counsel for accused.

(ANKUR JAIN)

Bail Application No.: 1836 Lokesh Sharma Vs. State

FIR No. : 59/20 PS : Mundka

08.09.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Pushpendu Shukla, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused.

Mr. Nagender Singh, Ld. Counsel for complainant with

complainant.

IO SI Ramesh from PS Mundka.

After hearing arguments it transpires that NBW have been issued against the accused. Ld. Counsel for accused seeks liberty to withdraw the present application. Statement of the Ld. Counsel for the accused is recorded separately. In view of the statement the present bail application is dismissed as withdrawn.

(ANKUR JAIN)

Bail Application No.: 1836 Lokesh Sharma Vs. State

FIR No. : 59/20

PS

: Mundka

U/s 420/468/471 IPC

Mr. Pushpendu Shukla, Ld. Counsel for accused, Enrollment no. D-411/2000.

Without Oath

may be permitted to withdraw the present bail application.

RO&AC

(ANKUR JAIN)

Bail Application No.: 1622
Pramod Singh Tomar Vs. State

FIR No. : 715/2020 PS : Ranhola

U/s: 498 IPC & Sec 4 Muslim Women
Protection Act

08.09.2020

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Rishi Pal Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Mr. R. K. Singh, Ld. Counsel for complainant.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/08.09.2020

01:10 PM

- 1. By this order I shall decide the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of accused Pramod Singh Tomar.
- 2. The brief facts of the case are that a complaint was given by one 'Ms. SB' to the effect that she was married to accused according to Muslim rites and within one year of the marriage

accused pronounced triple talak in violation of Muslim Women Protection Act, 2019.

- 3. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused has argued that both the parties have initiated civil proceedings for dissolution of the marriage and the accused is working as a doctor having deep routes in the society. As per the report of the IO he has joined the investigation and custodial interrogation of the accused is not required.
- 4. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State duly assisted by the Ld. Counsel for complainant has argued that accused had converted to Islam religion only to marry the complainant and within one year has pronounced divorce. It is also argued that no divorce was given by the accused to his first wife before converting to Islam which shows the mental status of the accused.
- 5. I have heard Ld. Addl. P. P. for State and Ld. Counsel for accused and perused the record.
- 6. In the present case the custodial interrogation of the accused in not required. Nothing has to be recovered from the possession of the accused. Neither anything has been stated in the FIR with respect to aspect of recovery. Accused has joined the investigation. Accordingly, in the event of arrest accused be released on bail in sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of SHO/ IO concerned with a direction that the accused shall not in any manner

A

contact the complainant or shall not try to influence her in any manner. He shall join the investigation as and when called by the IO and shall not hamper the investigation in any manner. Application disposed off. Copy of the order be given dastice.

Bail Application No.: 1915

Arun Vs. State

FIR No. : 800/2020 PS : Nihal Vihar

U/s : 336 IPC & 25/27/54/59

Arms Act

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

08.09.2020

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State. Mr. A. J. Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused. ASI Padam Singh in person.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/08.09.2020

12:50 PM

- 7. By this order I shall decide the regular bail application filed on behalf of accused Arun.
- 8. The brief facts of the case are that on 02.08.2020, ASI Padam Singh was handed over DD no. 92A who went to the spot and came to know that injured had been taken to hospital. He went

to the hospital obtained the MLC of the injured and later on recorded the statement of the victim. The complainant stated that on 02.08.2020 while he was standing outside his house four persons on a scooty were regularly moving around the house. Suddenly three persons came towards him, pushed him, entered the house and fired. While leaving they hit the complainant with the butt of the pistol.

- 9. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused has argued that present accused have no role to play in the incident dated 02.08.2020 and as such he should be enlarged on bail.
- 10. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has submitted that pistol had been recovered and as such accused is not entitled to bail.
- 11. I have heard Ld. Addl. P. P. for State and Ld. Counsel for accused and perused the record.
- of the accused persons. Accused are not connected with the crime committed in the above said FIR. They are in judicial custody since 22.08.2020 and are of young age. Accordingly accused are admitted to bail in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of MM / Duty MM concerned. Copy of the order be given dasti.

Bail Application No.: 1916

Saurabh Vs. State

FIR No.

: 800/2020

PS

: Nihal Vihar

U/s

336 IPC & 25/27/54/59

Arms Act

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

08.09.2020

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. A. J. Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

ASI Padam Singh in person.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)

ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01 West, THC, Delhi/08.09.2020

12:50 PM

- 1. By this order I shall decide the regular bail application filed on behalf of accused Saurabh.
- 2. The brief facts of the case are that on 02.08.2020, ASI Padam Singh was handed over DD no. 92A who went to the spot and came to know that injured had been taken to hospital. He went to the hospital obtained the MLC of the injured and later on

recorded the statement of the victim. The complainant stated that on 02.08.2020 while he was standing outside his house four persons on a scooty were regularly moving around the house. Suddenly, three persons came towards him, pushed him, entered the house and fired. While leaving they hit the complainant with the butt of the pistol.

- 3. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused has argued that present accused have no role to play in the incident dated 02.08.2020 and as such he should be enlarged on bail.
- 4. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has submitted that katta had been recovered and as such accused is not entitled to bail.
- 5. I have heard Ld. Addl. P. P. for State and Ld. Counsel for accused and perused the record.
- of the accused persons. Accused are not connected with the crime committed in the above said FIR. They are in judicial custody since 22.08.2020 and are of young age. Accordingly accused are admitted to bail in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of MM / Duty MM concerned. Copy of the order be given dasti.