FIR No. 398/2018 PS: Nabi Karim State Vs. Arjun @ Prem

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Naveen Gaur, counsel for accused-applicant.

Vide order dated 21.05.2020, the present bail application was directed to be put up before Ms. Charu Aggarwal, Ld. ASJ Central, Delhi for today. Inadvertently office has put this application before this Court.

In terms of directions contained in order dated 21.05.2020, application be put up before the Court of Ms. Charu Aggarwal, Ld. ASJ Central, Delhi today at 2 pm.

FIR No. 243/2018 PS: Nabi Karim State Vs. Akash Gautam

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. P. K. Garg, counsel for accused-applicant.

This is a fresh application for grant of interim bail for a period of 45 days. Be checked and registered.

After arguing for some time, Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that he does not wish to press upon this application at this stage and that the same may be dismissed as withdrawn.

It is ordered accordingly.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen)
ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

State Vs. Dhananjay @ Kalu PS: Karol Bagh FIR No. 34/2020

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Pradeep Kumar, counsel for accused-applicant.

of accused-applicant Dhananjay @ Kalu in case FIR No. 34/2020. This is a fresh application for grant of interim bail on behalf

Reply is filed.

It emerges that accused-applicant is in JC since 20.01.2020

and does not have clean antecedents.

After arguing for some time, counsel for the accused-applicant

seeks some time to place on record relevant documents in his possession.

Needful be done before the next date of hearing with advance copy served

upon the prosecution.

For report and consideration, put up on 29.05.2020. Family

status of the accused-applicant be also got verified. (Neelofer Abida Perveen)

ASJ (Contral)THC/Delhi

Scanned with CamScanner

FIR No. 348/2018 PS: Nabi Karim State Vs. Prakash @ Akash @ Chintu

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Sunil Tiwar, counsel for accused-applicant

(through video conferencing)

Hearing conducted through Video Conferencing.

This is an application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail for 45 days received through e-mail. Be registered.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that co-accused has been granted interim bail and the orders passed are annexed alongwith.

Reply of the prosecution is not received. IO to file reply upon verification of the antecedents/previous involvement, if any.

Jail Superintendent to furnish custody certificate alongwith good conduct report.

For report and consideration put up on 01.06.2020.

Order be forwarded on e-mail to the Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant by the Coordinator.

FIR No. 72/2011

PS: Sadar Bazar

State Vs. Naresh & Ors.

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Manoj Sharma, counsel for accused-applicant.

Fresh application for grant of interim bail for 60 days on behalf of accused Kishan @ Vicky in case FIR No. 72/2011 under Section 302/34 IPC received from Facilitation Centre. Be registered.

Reply has been filed.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that mother of the accused-applicant is almost blind and on her death bed and is being looked after by widow of his brother and that his other brother is also in JC alongwith him in the present case and there is no male member in the family to look after the old aged widowed mother of the accused-applicant. The previously also he was granted interim bail and had surrendered in terms thereof. It is contended that the accused-applicant is in custody since 11.05.2012.

It emerges that accused-applicant is in custody since 11.05.2012. It is contended by the prosecution that accused-applicant remained absconded and was declared proclaimed offender and was subsequently arrested on 11.05.2012 and that the matter is at the stage of final arguments.

Report be called from Superintendent Jail in respect of the

<u>a</u>

and

custody of the accused, his conduct. Report in respect of previous involvement, if any, of the accused-applicant be also filed by the IO.

For report and consideration, put up on **01.06.2020**.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen)
ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

FIR No. 98/2018

PS: Sadar Bazar

State Vs. Ranvir @ Ranglal

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. P. K. Garg, counsel for accused-applicant.

Fresh application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail for 45 days on behalf of accused-applicant Ranvir @ Ranglal received from Facilitation Centre. It be Checked and registered.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that case of the accused-applicant falls under the guidelines issued by High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court dated 18.05.2020. When it is put to the ld. Counsel, as to when accused is in custody, Ld. Counsel submits that accused is in custody since 28.05.2018.

After some arguments, ld. Counsel for the accused submits that at this stage, he does not want to press upon the present bail application and that the same may be dismissed as withdrawn. It is ordered accordingly.

C. C. No. 427/20196

PS: Crime Branch

State v. Bijender Singh (applicant Ashok)

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Naresh Kumar, counsel for accused-applicant

(through video conferencing)

Hearing conducted through Video Conferencing.

This is an application for correction and modification of order dated 19.05.2020 passed by the Court of Sh. Mohd. Farrukh, Ld. ASJ, Central, Delhi.

It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that in the order dated 19.05.2020 vide which ld. Court has been pleased to grant interim bail for 15 days to the accused-applicant upon furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/-, inadvertently, the case details have been wrongly mentioned as "FIR No. 427/2019" whereas the correct particulars are "C.C. No. 427/2019" and that the release order could not be issued as the name of the accused-applicant is not specifically mentioned in the said order.

I have gone through the order dated 19.05.2020 and the record of the bail application in which the same order came to be passed.

Perusal of the contents of the bail application would reveal that same is instituted in C. C. No. 427/2019 under Section 18 (a)/27(b)(11)/27 (c) Drug and Cosmetic Act, PS Crime Branch. However, in the order granting bail instead of C. C. no. 427/2019, it has been recorded as 'FIR No. 427/2019'. Further name of the accused-applicant is not apparent from the order. The inadvertent error in recording the case particulars is a typographical error and is

Nalohum.

not of such a nature as would amount to review in any manner of the order dated 19.05.25020. It is therefore directed that the order dated 19.05.2020 is to read to be passed in "C. C. No. 427/2019" and not in FIR No. 427/2019 and stands modified to this extent. In order to ensure effective compliance of order dated 19.05.2020, it is clarified that order dated 19.05.2020 is passed in bail application preferred by accused-applicant Ashok Kumar in C. C. No. 427/2019 and by order dated 19.05.2020, accused-applicant Ashok Kumar has been granted interim bail for 15 days in C. C. No. 427/2019 on the terms and conditions as laid down thereunder. The application stands allowed accordingly.

Order be forwarded on e-mail to the Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant by the Coordinator.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

FIR No. 163/2018 PS: Crime Branch State Vs. Joginder Pal @ Nishant Verma U/s 392/397/342/411/120B/34 IPC

22.05.2020

Fresh application for Regular Bail received. It be checked and registered.

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. D. K. Singh, counsel for accused-applicant (through video

conferencing)

Hearing conducted through Video Conferencing.

This is a fresh application for grant of regular bail on behalf of accused Joginder Pal Singh @ Nishant Verma in case FIR No. 163/2018.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that all the co-accused have already been granted bail way back on 10.01.2019 and 15.01.2019 and the relevant orders are annexed alongwith the application and that the accused-applicant is behind bars for more than 21 months now, and that the accused-applicant is entitled to bail on the ground of parity.

Ld. Addl. PP submits that the he has received the reply of the IO on his mobile phone through whatsapp. Copy of reply is not annexed alongwith the application for perusal of the Court. The Coordinator to ensure that reply is also tagged with the record of the present bail application.

Malglem

On a query of the Court, Ld. Addl. PP submits that there is no report received from the IO regarding antecedents of the accused-applicant. Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that he is not denying that the accused-applicant is involved in other criminal cases also.

Ld. Addl. PP submits that as per the own contention of the counsel for accused-applicant, accused-applicant does not have clean antecedents and as the complainant is yet to be examined, there is likelihood of the accused-applicant interfering in the course of justice in case released on bail.

Let report be call from the IO regarding criminal antecedents of the accused-applicant for the next date of hearing.

For report and consideration, put up on 28.05.2020.

Order be forwarded on e-mail to the Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant by the Coordinator.

FIR No. 271/2018

PS: DBG Road

State Vs. Prakash @ Akash @ Chintu

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. P. K. Garg, counsel for accused-applicant.

This is an application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail for a period of 45 days on the ground of welfare of ailing old father and mother. Be registered.

Reply is filed alongwith list of previous involvement of the accused-applicant.

Case pertains to offence under Section 307 IPC. Accused is in custody since 07.12.2018. Accused does not have clean antecedents. The grounds raised for grant of interim bail is the treatment of father and mother of the accused-applicant, however, no such medical record is filed alongwith the application. There is no medical record to substantiate the exceptional exigencies warranting consideration for grant of interim bail and in absence thereof, there is no material before the Court to consider existence of any such extraordinary circumstances as alleged in para 4 of the application. The present application for grant of interim bail is therefore dismissed.

FIR No. 266/2014 PS: Chandni Mahal State Vs. Fareed Ahmed U/s 302 IPC

22.05.2020

Fresh bail application for grant of interim bail is received. Be

registered.

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

None for accused-applicant.

Put up at 12 noon.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen)
ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi
22,05,2020

At 12 noon

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

None for accused-applicant.

Matter was passed over earlier as there was no representation for the accused-applicant. There is also no intimation of consent for taking up the hearing through video conferencing.

As there is no representation in the application despite pass

over, application is therefore dismissed in default.

FIR No. 44/2019 PS: Kashmere Gate State Vs. Ishtiaq Ali

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Rohit Kataria, Counsel for accused-applicant.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that the case of the accused-applicant fulfills all the criteria for the release of the undertrial for 45 days prescribed in the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi on 18.05.2020 as he is a senior citizen above 65 years age. When it is put to the ld. Counsel whether he has filed any document to show that the accused is a senior citizen above 65 years of age, Ld. Counsel for the accused seeks some time to file on record relevant documents.

Needful be done within four days with advance copy served upon the prosecution.

Ld. Addl. PP submits that reply of the IO was forwarded through whatsapp, however, the ground that is pressed upon in the course of arguments today has not been verified as the same was not taken in the application and no document in support thereof was also filed. Report be called from the Jail Superintendent in respect of the period of custody undergone in the present case FIR as also the conduct of the UTP. IO to also report on previous involvements, if any.

For report and consideration, put up on 30.05.2020.

Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

FIR No. 231/2016

PS: Kashmere Gate

State Vs. Sunita Singh

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. D. B. Yadav, Counsel for accused-applicant.

This is second application for grant of interim bail on behalf of accused Sunita Singh in case FIR No. 231/2016.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that case of the accused-applicant for grant of interim bail fulfills all the criteria laid down by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble the High Court of the Delhi under the guidelines issued on 18.05.2020 as accused-applicant is in custody since 07.12.2017.

As the application was not received through the DLSA from the Jail authorities alongwith requisite custody warrant and report on previous involvement if any, the application though claiming to be under the guidelines issued on 18.05.2020 has not been put up before the Ld. Designated Court.

Report be called for from the Jail Superintendent in respect of the period undergone and conduct of the accused-applicant. IO to also file report in respect of previous involvement if any.

For report and consideration, put up on 26.05.2020.

FIR No. 172/2016 PS: Pahar Ganj State Vs. Shahdat Ali.

22.05.2020

Fresh application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail received via E-mail. Be checked and registered.

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

None for accused-applicant.

Put up at 12 noon.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

22.05.2020

At 12 noon

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

None for accused-applicant.

Matter was passed over earlier as there was no representation for the accused-applicant. There is also no intimation of consent for taking up the hearing through video conferencing.

As there is no representation in the application despite pass over, application is therefore dismissed in default.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

FIR No. 123/2017

PS: Crime Branch

State Vs. Emeka Ifoh Stephen

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

sh. Ravinder Kumar, counsel for accused-applicant.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that accused-applicant who is a foreign national has now been able to arrange surety and therefore the present application for releasing the accused on bail on personal bond is not being pressed upon and may be dismissed as withdrawn. It is ordered accordingly.

FIR No. 78/2018

PS: Maurice Nagar

State Vs. Bhola @ sunil

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Counsel for accused-applicant.

After arguing for some time, ld. Counsel for the accused-

applicant submits that present the application may be dismissed as

withdrawn. It is ordered accordingly.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen)

ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

FIR No. 183/2018 PS: Crime Branch State Vs. Yogesh @ Goverdhan

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State with IO.

Sh. Girish Sharma, Counsel for the accused-applicant.

Reply is filed.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant seeks some time to file on record the latest medical documents in respect of the treatment that is being availed by the father of the accused-applicant at RR Army Hospital. Medical record be filed by tomorrow with advance copy served upon the prosecution for verification. IO to also verify family status besides the medical record any if furnished.

For report and consideration, put up on 26.05.2020.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

FIR No. 179/2017

PS: EOW

State Vs. Avdesh Kumar Goel

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Counsel for accused-applicant.

This is an application for waiving of the conditions of bail in respect of surety bond for a sum of Rs.5 lac.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits the accused applicant due to the prevailing situation in the country arising out of the outbreak of Covid-19 Pandemic is not in a position to arrange surety of Rs. 5 lac. When it is put to the Ld. Counsel that the order imposing the condition was passed way back on 06.04.2019, over a year ago, Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that the co-accused have also been granted bail in the present case however, upon much lesser bond amounts. Ld. Counsel submits that the orders were not readily available with the accused-applicant and therefore were not filed.

In terms of directions issued on 21.05.2020, office reports that the bail order in question dated 06.04.2019 is not available with the Bail Filing Branch.

In the course of arguments, it also came to light that there are several FIRs registered against the accused-applicant. Ld. Counsel submits that in most of the other cases accused-applicant has been granted bail.

Nalshim

Opportunity is granted to the accused-applicant to file on record all the orders reliance of which is being sought by the accused-applicant for reduction of the surety amount.

Put up on **12.06.2020** as per request.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen)

ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

FIR No. 117/2018

PS: Maurice Nagar

State Vs. Sarabjit

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. B. S. Chaudhary Counsel for accused-applicant.

This is an application for grant of interim bail on behalf of accused Sarabjit @ Lucky in FIR no. 117/2018 under Section 376/506 IPC on account of outbreak of Covid-19.

When it is put to the ld. Counsel as to what is the ground setup for grant of interim bail, ld. Counsel submits that interim bail is being sought as per the guidelines of Honble Supreme Court and Honble the High Court of Delhi. When it is put to the Ld. Counsel as to which of the guidelines issued by the Honble High Court of Delhi would cover the case of the accused-applicant as he is the accused in a case under Section 376 IPC, ld. Counsel submits that all the prosecution witnesses have been examined.

Heard.

As the case pertains to commission of offence under Section 376 IPC, case of the accused-applicant is not covered under any of the guidelines laid down from time to time by the High Powered Committed of the Honble the High Court of Delhi for de-congestion of Jails in Delhi in the wake of outbreak of Covid-19 and no other exceptional exigencies has been set up in the application for grant of interim bail. The present application for grant of interim bail is therefore dismissed. Dasti

FIR No. 367/2015

PS: Kotwali State Vs. Imran

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Harish Kumar, counsel for accused-applicant.

This a fresh application for direction to the Jail Superintendent for release of accused-applicant from JC in case FIR No. 367/2015 and appeal no. 396/2018. Be registered.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that accused-applicant was in custody in connection with FIR No. 11/2019. Though in para no. 1 of the application it is stated that appeal was admitted and accused-applicant was granted bail and surety was accepted by the Court of Ms. Charu Aggarwal, Ld. ASJ, Delhi, however, as would emerge from the order annexed at page no. 3 of the paper book in Crl. Appeal No. 396/2018, directions for suspension of sentence and admission on bail and furnishing of bonds is contained in order dated 23.10.2018 passed by Sh. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Ld. Special Judge, PC Act, CBI and bail bonds were also furnished before and accepted by the same Court. It is contended that accused-applicant who was subsequently arrested in case FIR No. 11/2019 PS Shashtri Park has since been released in the said case FIR, however, no such order has been filed on record.

Opportunity is granted to the applicant to file the appropriate order. Report be also called from Superintendent Jail. For report and

Nalstern.

consideration, put up on 26.05.2020.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi 22.05.2020

At this stage, IO has filed list of previous involvement. It emerges that there are numerous FIRs in connection with which accused-applicant is undergoing judicial custody. Put up on date fixed for purpose fixed.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen)

ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

Crl. Appeal No. 15/2019

PS: Sadar Bazar

Rajender Kumar v. M/s Ajay Industrial Corporation

22.05.2020

Fresh application received. Be registered.

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Shivam Chowdhry, counsel for accused-applicant

(through video conferencing)

Hearing conducted through Video Conferencing.

This is an application under Section 439 CrPC for modification of order dated 19.02.2019 passed by the Court of Dr. Kamini Lau, Ld. ASJ, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi in Criminal Appeal No. 15/2019.

Heard.

It emerges that applicant was convicted under Section 138 N. I. Act and sentenced to SI of one year and compensation Rs. 9,94,680/- with default sentence of 6 months vide judgment of conviction dated 17.01.2019 and order on sentence dated 21.01.2019 which judgment and order were assailed by way of Crl. Appeal no. 15/2019 and vide order dated 19.02.2019 the appellant/convict was directed to deposit a sum of Rs. 5 lacs in installments and order on sentence was suspended till the next date of hearing subject to deposit of installments of Rs. 1 lac within 15 days which was deposited vide FDR taken on record on 06.03.2019 and remaining was directed to be deposited by the next date of hearing with order on sentence suspended on such conditions till next date of hearing. Vide order dated 28.01.2020 the appellant-convict was ordered to be taken into custody for failure to comply with order dated 19.02.2019. And now this application for modification of order dated 19.02.2019 has came to be

Welstum.

filed. Notice is to be served in the application to the complainant/respondent. The mobile phone number and e-mail ID of the complainant / respondent are not mentioned in the present application. In fact even the address of the respondent is not given, there is no memo of parties annexed to the application. The applicant shall furnish the memo of parties with complete address details alongwith mobile phone number and email ID withi documents in support thereof for service of the respondent. Needful be done within one week.

Issue notice of the application to the respondent for 15.06.2020.

Ld. Counsel submits that till the next date of hearing accused-applicant may be admitted on interim bail. There is no such application, however, filed alongwith the present application.

Order be forwarded on e-mail to the Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant by the Coordinator.

CS No. ____ NSK Hospital Vs. Sudarshan Channel & Ors.

21.05.2020 At 2.30 p.m.

Present: Shri Rishi Pal Singh, ld. counsel for plaintiff

None for defendant nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4

Ld. counsel for plaintiff has filed copy of e-mail dated 15.05.2020 and affidavit in support of service of defendant nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4. However, none has appeared on their behalf since morning till 2.30 p.m. Ld. counsel for plaintiff seeks one more opportunity to serve defendant no. 2 through Whatsapp. Heard. Allowed.

Put up for service report on 02.06.2020

(GEETANJALI)
ADJ-3 (CENTRAL)
TIS HAZARI COURTS
DELHI/21.05.2020

CS No. ____ Sharda Devi Vs. Arun Kumar & Ors.

21.05.2020 At 1.00 p.m.

Present: Plaintiff in person with ld. counsel Shri Abdul Salam None for respondents.

None has appeared on behalf of the respondent despite wait. Hence matter is adjourned. In the interest of justice, respondents are directed to file written statement within ten days with advance copy to the opposite side a week before next date of hearing.

Put up for replication/further proceedings on

01.06.2020.

Interim order to continue. What follows

(GEETANJALI)
ADJ\3 (CENTRAL)
TIS HAZARI COURTS

DELHI/21.05.2020

FIR No. 311/2019

PS: STARS-II, Crime Branch

State Vs. Priyan Ranjan Shrama

22.05.2020

Fresh application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail on behalf of accused Priya Ranjan received via E-mail.

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Pankaj Garg, counsel for accused-applicant (through video

conferencing)

Hearing conducted through Video Conferencing.

Reply is filed.

It is put to the Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant that interim bail is being sought on what ground, at which ld. Counsel had drawn the attention of the Court to para (c) & (d) at page no. 7 & 8 and para C at page no. 11 of the paper book of the grounds. Ld. Counsel submits that as has been reported in national newspapers that 10 of the jail officials at Rohini Jail have tested positive for corona virus and number of prisoners in ward no. 3, Barrack 204, Rohini Jail are much more that what should had been according to the Jail Manual and that interim bail is urgently required in order to safe guard the life of the accused-applicant and to prevent any possibility of accused-applicant becoming infected with Covid-19 which is not possible at the crowded Rohini Jail as several of its official themselves have contracted the infection. That as he would be forced to be quarantine himself, there is no likelihood of his committing

Kolotum

any similar offence. That his application for regular bail was earlier dismissed only on the ground that chargesheet is yet to be filed, however, interim bail was granted to the accused and he has not misused the concession granted to him in any manner.

At this stage, ld. Counsel for the accused submits that he seeks to place reliance upon judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi passed in similar circumstances granting interim bail and that he shall forward the same through e-mail. The judicial pronouncement sought to be relied upon may be forwarded through e-mail to the Coordinator. Ld. Counsel further insists that report be called from the Jail Superintendent as to how many positive cases of Covid-19 are reported at Rohini Jail.

A High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi is already seized of the issue pertaining to decongestion of prisoners in Delhi in the wake of the outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic with the Director General (Prisoner) as a member of the committee laying down guidelines and measures on different fronts for all stakeholders. There is no necessity for embarking upon any such proceedings for this Court along parallel lines by calling report in this regard from the Jail Superintendent concerned.

For orders, put up on 23.05.2020.

Order be forwarded on e-mail to the Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant by the Coordinator.

FIR No. 302/2018

PS: Pahar Ganj

State Vs. Dharam Singh @ Vicky

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Suraj Prakash Sharma, counsel for accused.

Reply is filed by the IO to the effect that the medical documents were forwarded on whatsapp to him and the same could not be verified due to lockdown.

It emerges that the medical record that is annexed alongwith the application on the court record is illegible. Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant on query of the Court has clarified that wife of the accused-applicant is receiving treatment from District Hospital, Agra. The legible copy of the medical record be filed within two days. IO to verify from Medical Officer Incharge, District Hospital Agra, in respect of the treatment being availed by the wife of the accused-applicant namely Ms. Neha Sonkar telephonically. Report may be transmitted via electronic mode.

For report and consideration on 27.05.2020.

FIR No. 05/2014

PS: Special Cell

State Vs. Kurban @ Mohd. Qurban

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Suraj Prakash Sharma, counsel for accused-applicant.

This is an application for grant of interim bail for 45 days on behalf of the accused Kurban @ Mohd. Qurban in case FIR No. 05/2014.

Arguments heard. For orders, put up at 4 pm.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

22.05.2020

ORDER at 4 pm

This is an application for grant of interim bail for 45 days on behalf of accused Kurban accused in case FIR No. 5/2014.

The sole ground raised in this application for grant of interim bail is long custody of over six years. It is also contended that name of the accused-applicant is not mentioned in the FIR.

Reply is filed.

The cases registered under NDPS Act involving intermediate / commercial quantity of contraband have specifically been kept out of the previous of several guidelines laid down by High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court from time to time.

Naldru

Interim bail can alone be granted in compelling circumstances and in such extraordinary exigencies where personal presence of the accused would be absolutely indispensable. In the case in hand, there are no compelling circumstances calling for release of the accused-applicant on interim bail in the present case. Interim bail application is accordingly dismissed. Dasti.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central) THC/Delhi

FIR No. 199/2009

PS: Kashmere Gate

State Vs. Gaurav Chauhan

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

None for accused-applicant.

Put up at 12 noon.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

22.05.2020

At 12 noon

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

None for accused-applicant.

Matter was passed over earlier as there was no representation There is also no intimation of consent for for the accused-applicant. taking up the hearing through video conferencing.

As there is no representation in the application despite pass over, application is therefore dismissed in default.

FIR No. 81/2013 PS: Kasmhere Gate State Vs. Nitin Kashyap & Ors.

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. R. K. Mishra, counsel for accused-applicant.

Fresh bail application received. Be registered.

This is an application for grant of bail and cancellation of NBWs issued against the accused and any other alternative interim relief.

Reply is filed.

It emerges that accused-applicant was on regular bail in case FIR No. 81/2013, however, he absented himself due to which NBWs were issued against him and in execution thereof, accused was sent to JC in October, 2019 upon dismissal of application for cancellation of NBWs preferred by him. As per contents of para 5 of the application, matter is at the stage of defence evidence.

Accused-applicant has proven to be flight risk and has misued the concession on previous occasion. The record of the case would be required for the purpose of present bail application as the accused-applicant has not filed any of the orders referred to in para no. 3 & 4 of the application.

It emerges that trial is pending in the case FIR No. 81/2013 in the Court of Ms. Charu Aggarwal, Ld. ASJ, Central, Delhi. As per the roster circulated, Ms. Charu Aggarwal, ld. ASJ would be holding Court on

Naldun

30.05.2019. It is therefore directed that application be put up before Ms. Charu Aggarwal, Ld. ASJ, Delhi on **30.05.2020** alongwith record for its efficacious disposal.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen)

ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi 22.05.2020 FIR No. 415/2015 PS: Kotwali State Vs. Sunil @Ors

22,05,2020

Fresh bail application received. It be checked and registered.

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State with IO.

Sh. .Ashish Kumar, Counsel for accused-applicant.

Arguments heard. For orders, put at 4 pm.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

22.05.2020

ORDER at 4 pm.

This is an application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail on behalf of accused Sanjeev in case FIR No. 415/2015 on the ground to enable him to solve domestic issue. Ld. Counsel submits that the marriage of the accused/applicant is on the verge of being broken as his father has refused to take care of his wife and five year old daughter.

Reply is filed. It is reported that the wife of the accused-applicant is being looked after by the father of the accused-applicant. It is further stated that earlier application of the accused on same ground was dismissed on 02.05.2020. Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that said application was not dismissed on merits but was dismissed as

Noelgann

withdrawn due to some technical issue. It is pertinent however that the order is not unnexed and in the body of the application, there is no mention of any such bail application having been filed earlier on similar grounds. Ld. Counsel submits that though it is not so stated in the body of the application, however it is disclosed in the proforma annext to the application. The only ground setup is for resolving of the domestic issues what are the issues to be resolved are not explained in the application, however, it has been submitted on behalf of the accused-applicant that there are certain matrimonial issues to be resolved as his father is no longer taking care of his family consisting his wife and minor daughter.

The report of the IO is, however, contrary to the contention raised by the ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant. Interim bail can alone be granted in compelling circumstances and in such extraordinary exigencies where personal presence of the accused would be absolutely indispensable. In the case in hand, there are no compelling circumstances calling for release of the accused-applicant on interim bail in the present case. Present bail application is therefore liable to be dismissed as ground setup has gone unsubstantiated. Bail application is accordingly dismissed. Dasti.

FIR No. 668/2015 PS: Sadar Bazar State v. Mohd. Sadatt.

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mohd. Salim, counsel for accused-applicant.

Arguments heard. For orders, put up on 23.05.2020al & have to

go for remand of UTPs. re.

FIR No. 64/2020 PS: Nabi Karim State Vs. Parveen & Ors.

22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Sh. Vijay Sharma, counsel for accused-applicant.

This is an application for extension of interim bail under

Section 439 CrPC.

Arguments heard. For orders put up at 4 pm.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi 22.05.2020

At 4 pm

Present:

None.

Certain clarifications are required.

Claudications and properties.

For orders put up on 23.05.2020.

(Neelofer Abida Perveen) ASJ (Central)THC/Delhi

22.05,2020

FIR No. 47/2019 PS: Crime Branch State Vs. Manish Guatam 22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State with IO.

Sh. Deepak Ghai, counsel for accused-applicant.

This is an application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail in case FIR No. 47/2019 on behalf of accused Munish Gautam.

Reply is filed.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that family of the accused-applicant consisting of his wife who hails from the North East and minor son is on the verge of penury and that the funds for everyday expenses also cannot be accessed by them as the money is to be withdrawn from his bank account by the accused-applicant.

It emerges that details and particulars in respect of the bank account of the accused-applicant from where money is to be withdrawn to make provision for the wife and child is not mentioned in the application. Ld. Counsel submits that to the best of his information that the accused-applicant holds account in Punjab National Bank and most probably at Wazirabad bank. Ld. Counsel seeks some time to verify and file on record correct details and particulars of the bank account details of the accused-applicant.

Put up on 27.05.2020 for consideration.

FIR No.214/2017 PS: Crime Branch State Vs. Gulshan

22.05.2020

Fresh bail application received. Be registered.

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Ms. Rashmi Kaushik, counsel for accused-applicant James

(through Video conferencing)

Hearing conducted through Video Conferencing.

This is an application for grant of interim bail on behalf of accused-applicant on the ground of illness of his son namely Ayush

Reply is filed, however, there is no report regarding family status and verification of medical documents annexed with the application.

Let report be called from the IO regarding family status and verification of medical documents annexed with the application.

For report and consideration, put up on 28.05.2020.

Order be forwarded on e-mail to the Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant by the Coordinator.

FIR No. 47/2019 PS: Crime Branch State Vs. Manish Guatam 22.05.2020

Present:

Sh. K.P.Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State with IO.

Sh. Deepak Ghai, counsel for accused-applicant.

This is an application under Section 439 CrPC for grant of interim bail in case FIR No. 47/2019 on behalf of accused Munish Gautam.

Reply is filed.

Ld. Counsel for the accused-applicant submits that family of the accused-applicant consisting of his wife who hails from the North East and minor son is on the verge of penury and that the funds for everyday expenses also cannot be accessed by them as the money is to be withdrawn from his bank account by the accused-applicant.

It emerges that details and particulars in respect of the bank account of the accused-applicant from where money is to be withdrawn to make provision for the wife and child is not mentioned in the application. Ld. Counsel submits that to the best of his information that the accused-applicant holds account in Punjab National Bank and most probably at Wazirabad bank. Ld. Counsel seeks some time to verify and file on record correct details and particulars of the bank account details of the accused-applicant.

Put up on 27.05.2020 for consideration.