FIR No. 656/20, P.S. Nihal Vihar U/s 307/506 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act

State Vs. DK @ Ajay Choudhary

05.08.2020

Present:

Sh. Robin Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State

Dheeraj Kumar, a clerk of Sh. R.S. Malik, Ld. Counsel for

applicant/accused DK @ Ajay Choudhary

IO SI Amit Nara absent

This is application dated 04.08.2020 moved U/s 439 Cr.PC on behalf of accused/applicant DK @ Ajay Choudhary for grant of bail. Reply sent through Naib Court. Copy be supplied to the accused.

At request on behalf of accused, adjourned for hearing on the bail application on 06.08.2020.

Issue notice to IO to appear with case file.

(Dr. Archana Sinha)

Addl. Sessions Judge-06(West)

Tis Hazari Courts: Delhi/05.08.2020

FIR No. 128/20, P.S. Hari Nagar U/s 302/304B/498A/406/34 IPC

State Vs. Surender Singh

05.08.2020

(<u>During lockdown period due to Covid-19 pandemic</u>, these proceedings are conducted through Video Conferencing using Cisco Webex)

Present:

Sh. Robin Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State

Complainant Chander Pal Singh (both Physically present)

Sh. Arun Sharma, Ld. Counsel for complainant

Sh. Pradeep Rana, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Surender

Singh

10 Inspector Mukesh Kumar

(all three present through video conferencing)

This is application dated 04.08.2020 moved U/s 438 Cr.PC on behalf of accused/applicant Surender Singh for grant of anticipatory bail.

Detailed reply dated 05.08.2020, running into 5 pages, has been filed by IO Inspector Mukesh Kumar. Copy of the same has been supplied to Ld. Counsel for accused on his mobile No.9811141234, through Whatsapp and also sent through email given on the vakalatnama.

Copy of the same be also sent to Ld. Counsel appearing for the complainant.

Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant has submitted that the applicant is father-in-law of the deceased, working with Delhi Police as ASI, present posted in Traffic Unit.

It is also informed that even the complainant is an ASI working with Delhi Police and is presently posted as Naib Court of Sh.Deepak Jagotra, Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

Contd...2



State Vs. Surender Singh

05.08.2020

Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant has further submitted that the incident had taken place in the night in the room where the deceased and her husband were sleeping and the applicant was sleeping in another room and on coming to know that the unfortunate incident had taken place, he was the person who had taken the deceased to the hospital but she died there.

As per post-mortem report, the death was caused by strangulation.

It is further submitted that as per the FIR, there are no allegations raised against the present applicant/accused either regarding demand of dowry or for any kind of specific harassment.

The IO and Ld. Counsel for the complainant alongwith the Ld. Addl. PP for the State have submitted that there are allegations against the in-laws that includes the present applicant/accused and IO has informed that there was some Whatsapp Call made by the deceased to her sister just prior to the alleged incident raising allegations against the present applicant, her father-in-law, and that for retrieving such mobile data, the mobile phone has been sent to FSL but the FSL report has not yet been received, shall be taken up earliest.

Ld. Counsel for the complainant has submitted that the husband of the deceased is in JC, the anticipatory bail of the mother-in-law has been dismissed by the Ld. Sessions Court and against the anticipatory bail order of the sister-in-law namely Ritu, an application for cancellation of bail is pending before the Hon'ble High Court and is fixed for 28.08.2020.

It is further submitted that the deceased was harassed for dowry and within the period of 2 months, she died due to strangulation.

Contd...3

State Vs. Surender Singh 05.08.2020

The IO has informed that the proceedings u/s 82 Cr.PC have been initiated against the present applicant as he was not available either in his own police quarter or in his native place in the house of his father nor he has joined his duties since the day of FIR and that the applicant/accused is required for the purpose of custodial interrogation as recovery of Rs.10 Lakhs and dowry articles is to be effected and even his mobile phone is required for the purpose of CDR and also for other investigation.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submits that the accused is residing in his own house allotted to him in police quarters and also sometimes in his father's house as he is not keeping well and he is ready to join the investigation as and when required and shall be able to furnish the details of his whereabouts to the investigating agency.

As the basic limb of anticipatory bail is that the applicant/accused should be available and present for the purpose of joining of investigation, thus, the accused / applicant is directed to join the investigation firstly on 17.08.2020 at 12 noon with the directions that he shall get himself tested for Covid-19 and shall produce the report of test of Covid-19, to the IO, before joining the investigation and he shall further join the investigation as and when required by the IO, on receiving written notice from him for next date with specific timings, of joining the investigation.

He shall also furnish his complete details of his present and permanent addresses of his availability during investigation or trial and shall provide supporting relevant documents of his addresses/places of availability.

Contd...4

FIR No. 128/20, P.S. Hari Nagar U/s 302/304B/498A/406/34 IPC

State Vs. Surender Singh

05.08.2020

The applicant/accused is directed to co-operate with the investigation and non-joining of investigation shall be taken very seriously.

Be listed for further hearing on the anticipatory bail application on 29.08.2020.

As the accused is a Government Servant working with Delhi Police having his residence in the Govt. Accommodation allotted by Delhi Police, till the next date, no coercive steps of his arrest shall be taken by the IO.

IO is directed to produce the FSL Result regarding retrieval of the mobile data on or before the next date.

A copy of this order be given dasti to all concerned parties including the IO through email or whatsapp, as per the information available on record, for information and compliance.

(Dr. Archaria Sinha)
Addl. Sessions Judge 06(West)
Tis Hazari Courts: Delhi/05.08.2020

FIR No. 366/20, P.S. Mundka U/s 308/34 IPC

State Vs. Naveen

05.08.2020

(During lockdown period due to Covid-19 pandemic, these proceedings are conducted through Video Conferencing using Cisco Webex)

Present:

Sh. Robin Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State

.Sh. Anuj Arya, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Naveen

IO SI Lahit Kumar

(all present through video conferencing)

This is application dated 23.07.2020 moved U/s 439 Cr.PC on behalf of accused/applicant Naveen for grant of bail.

Reply has already been filed by IO and its copy has already been supplied to Ld. Counsel for accused.

IO has informed that the final opinion on MLC has been procured and as per the opinion the nature of injury was simple.

In support of the bail application, it is submitted on behalf of the applicant/accused that the present applicant/accused was a driver running his private van as Taxi to carry the passegers on hire and there were 5-6 people in his van when a scuffle had taken place with the complainant who was on the bike on the road as there was spitting by one of the passengers of the van and that as per the allegations against the present applicant/accused, he used abusive language only.

On behalf of the State, to counter the contentions of the Ld. Counsel for the accused, it is submitted that the offences are serious in nature and the weapon used was iron rod. Thus, it is submitted that granting bail to the accused will hamper the trial as the chances of tempering of evidence and hampering of the trial cannot be ruled out.

Contd....2

h

FIR No. 366/20, P.S. Mundka U/s 308/34 IPC

State Vs. Naveen

05.08.2020

Observing the above-noted facts and circumstances, the role specified for the present applicant/accused, the final opinion on the MLC of the injured, injury was 'simple' in nature and his antecedents otherwise are clean, the court is of the considered view that no purpose would be served to keep the liberty of the accused at peril during investigation or trial, if he is available to face the trial.

Thus, the accused is admitted on bail on furnishing bail bond and surety bond of Rs.30,000/- with one surety of like amount, subject to the conditions:

- 1. He shall not leave the country without permission of the court.
- 2. He shall not visit the place of the complainant / injured in any manner during trial and shall not try to temper the evidence or hamper the trial, in any manner.
- 3. He shall furnish his present and permanent address with supporting documents along with an affidavit/undertaking to inform any change that of without delay.
- 4. He shall attend the trial without any single default.
- 5. He shall attend the investigation as and when required by the IO.

Any observations and expressions in this order shall not tantamount to any adverse influence on the merits of the case.

With these conditions bail application moved under section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail to accused Naveen stands disposed of.

Copy of the order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary information and compliance.

(Dr. Archarda Sinha) Addl. Sessions Judge-06(West) Tis Hazari Courts : Delhi/05.08.2020

FIR No. 344/2018, P.S. Nihal Vihar U/s 302 IPC

State Vs. Bharat

05.08.2020

Present:

Sh. Robin Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State

None for applicant/accused Bharat

This is application dated 21.07.2020 moved U/s 439 Cr.PC on behalf of accused/applicant Bharat for grant of interim bail.

It is informed on behalf of State that the FIR number in this case is not correctly written in the application and it is informed from PS Nihal Vihar by Inspector Jitender Dagar that there is a case registered vide FIR No.209/19 dated 25.03.2019 u/s 302 IPC in PS Nihal Vihar in which accused Bharat is in judicial custody.

The reply dated 23.07.2020 has been sent to the Court by Inspector. Copy of the reply for the accused is kept on record for supply to the accused as none has appeared on behalf of accused, despite repeated calls since morning.

Thus, the application is dismissed for non-prosecution due to not furnishing the correct particulars of the case and also in default, for non-appearance of anyone on behalf of accused.

(Dr. Archana Sinha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-06(West)

Tis Hazari Courts: Delhi/05.08.2020

FIR No. 410/20, P.S. Maya Puri U/s 308 IPC

State Vs. Naresh Kumar

05.08.2020

Present:

Sh. Robin Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State

Sh. Nepal Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Naresh

Kumar

This is application dated 28.07.2020 moved U/s 439 Cr.PC on behalf of accused/applicant Naresh Kumar for grant of bail.

An incomplete & unsigned reply has been received as reflected in the orders dated 29.07.2020.

IO SI Vipin has informed the Naib Court through telephone that he had received no notice of the application in this case.

The complainant was also directed to be present in view of the observations made by the Court vide order dated 29.07.2020 but the concerned Naib Court of PS Mayapuri has informed that no notice has been received for the complainant also.

Let the notice be issued to the IO and to the complainant who shall be produced by the IO.

Be listed for hearing on the bail application on 10.08.2020.

(Dr. Archana Sinha) Addl. Sessions Judge-06(West) Tis Hazari Courts : Delhi/05.08.2020

FIR No. 728/20, P.S. Ranhola U/s 308/34 IPC

State Vs. Raju Soni

05.08.2020

Present:

Sh. Robin Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State

Ms. Mani Chaudhary, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Raju

Soni

Prosecutrix alongwith complainant of case FIR No.737/20 in

person

This is application dated 29.07.2020 moved U/s 439 Cr.PC on behalf of accused/applicant Raju Soni for grant of bail.

Reply dated 05.08.2020 has been filed by the IO. Copy of reply supplied.

It is informed that the connected case vide FIR No.737/20 PS Ranhola, titled as State Vs. Dinesh Giri, in which the bail application was pending yesterday i.e. 04.08.2020 and the same has been posted for 07.08.2020 with the directions to the IO of that case to appear with case file.

The matter shall be taken up through video conferencing as prayed and is also fixed through that mode in FIR No.737/20.

The prosecutrix and the complainant of FIR No.737/20 are present before this Court and are directed to be present through video conferencing on 07.08.2020 at the time of hearing of this bail application, in view of mandate prescribed in the Practice Directions dated 24.09.2019 in view of orders of Hon'ble High Court in case titled as **Reena Jha Vs. Union of India** passed by HMJ Sh. Brijesh Sethi.

At request, this application is also posted for **07.08.2020** for hearing on the bail application alongwith bail application of accused Dinesh Giri in FIR No.737/2020.

Issue notice to IO to remain present with case file.

(Dr) Archana Sinha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-06(West)
Tis Hazari Courts : Delhi/05.08.2020

FIR No. Unknown, P.S. Mundka U/s Unknown

State Vs. Lalit Kumar

05.08.2020

Present:

Sh. Robin Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State

Sh. Mukesh Birla, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Lalit

Kumar

(Both present physically in Court)

IO SI Lalita (present through video conferencing)

This is application dated 31.07.2020 moved U/s 438 Cr.PC on behalf of accused/applicant Lalit Kumar for grant of anticipatory bail.

Reply dated 05.08.2020 has been filed by IO W/SI Lalita. Copy of reply supplied to Ld. Counsel for accused.

As per reply no case has been registered against the applicant and the complaint of the complainant has been kept pending as the complainant did not want any action on her complaint. Copy of such complaint be supplied to the applicant.

IO has informed that on receiving of the complaint, she had made a telephone call to the applicant but the complainant has informed that she did not want any action on her complaint, that is why, no notice was given to the applicant.

In support of the bail application, it is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is a Govt. Servant working in CISF posted at Assam and is under the threats of police action at the behest of the complainant who is black-mailing the applicant and he has already transferred certain amount through his account to her account.

In the above noted circumstances, considering the norms settled by the Apex Court in case titled as Arnesh Vs. State of Bihar decided on 02-07-2014 in Crl. Appeal No. 1277 of 2014,

Contd...2



FIR No. Unknown, P.S. Mundka U/s Unknown

State Vs. Lalit Kumar

05.08.2020

SLP No. 9127 of 2013, the IO of the case is directed to clearly inform about disposal of the complaint, if any and in case of registration of the FIR, she shall give a proper notice, in writing, of at least 15 days to the applicant Lalit Kumar regarding registration of the FIR and joining the investigation.

As no FIR has been registered so far, the application u/s 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant/accused Lalit Kumar is not maintainable.

With these observations, the application of applicant Lalit Kumar stands disposed of.

Dasti copy of the order is allowed to the applicant and the IO, as prayed.

(Dr. Archaha Sinha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-06(West)
Tis Hazari Courts: Delhi/05.08.2020