

FIR No.688/2020  
PS: Moti Nagar  
State vs. Jaideep

15.11.2020

**This is an application u/s 437 CrPC for grant of bail of accused Jaideep.**

**Present:** None for the State.

Mr. Amit Punia, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused Jaideep  
S/o Sh. Tek Ram R/o WZ-29, Gali No.3, Rattan Park, Ramgarh  
Colony, Moti Nagar and VPO Sanghi, Rohtak, Haryana.

Reply has been received from IO SI Manjeet Singh.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, he is in JC since 12.11.2020, at the time of alleged incident the car of the accused got broke down in the middle of the road, upon which the complainant approached and kicked the bumper of his car and started abusing, which started the hustle, but no such incident of removing the turban and hurting the religious sentiments happened, he has clean antecedents, accused is a young boy aged 24 years who is presently residing in Delhi only for preparation and obtain a government job and that he be released on bail.

On the other hand, IO SI Manjeet Singh in his reply has objected to the release of accused on the ground that co-accused are yet to be arrested, to prevent accused from committing any further offence, to prevent him for causing the evidence to disappear and prevent him from making any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case.

Contd...2/-



-2-

Heard. Perused.

As per the report of IO, accused Jaideep was taken into PC remand on 12.11.2020, raids were conducted in Rohtak and Sonipat for the arrest of co-accused but in vain. On this ground bail is strongly opposed. However, the IO had sufficient opportunity to arrest the co-accused, keeping in view the overall facts & circumstances of the case, age of the accused and the fact that there is no previous involvement of the accused in any criminal case, no purpose would be served by keeping the accused in jail, hence, **accused Jaideep is admitted to bail** on furnishing personal bond **in the sum of Rs.15,000/- with one surety in the like amount** subject to conditions that :-

1. He shall not come into contact or threaten or influence the complainant and witnesses.
2. He shall join the investigation as and when he is called upon by the IO.
3. He shall not tamper with evidence.
4. He shall appear before the court on each and every date of hearing.

**Accordingly, bail application is disposed of.**

**Bail bond/surety bond furnished and accepted.**

**Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned.**

**Let copy of this order be given dasti.**

*Aakanksha*  
(Aakanksha) 15/11/2020

Duty MM/West/Delhi/15.11.2020

**FIR No.789/2020**  
**PS: Punjabi Bagh**  
**State vs. Mohit**  
**u/s 356/379/34 IPC**

15.11.2020

**This is an application u/s 437 CrPC for grant of bail of accused Mohit.**

**Present:** None for the State.

Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused Mohit S/o Sankar Lal R/o B-2/430, Sultan Puri, Delhi.

Reply has been received from IO ASI Bijender Singh.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, he is in JC since 15.10.2020, accused belongs to poor strata of society, that every man is deemed to be innocent until found guilty, that he is ready and willing to join investigation as and when required, that he is on bail in all the other cases pending against him and that he be released on bail.

On the other hand, IO ASI Bijender Singh in his reply has objected to the release of accused on the ground that his judicial TIP is fixed for 19.11.2020.

Ld. Counsel for accused is posed a query by this Court as to whether the present bail application is first bail application or not, upon which he wrote first bail application on the application itself. At this stage, it is brought to the notice of undersigned by Ahlmad that IO ASI Bijender Singh has telephonically informed him that previous a bail application was filed in the present case even before, for which he had sent a reply on

Contd....2/-



-2-

10.11.2020. At this stage, Ld. Counsel for the accused submits that this is the first bail application which has been filed by Ld. Counsel and that he is not aware as to whether any other bail application was filed by some other counsel for the same accused in the said case and sought for five minutes to get it confirmed.

After five minutes, Ld. Counsel for the accused appeared and stated that **this is the second bail application and the previous one has already been dismissed by the concerned Court.** When the undersigned started dictating the said conduct, Ld. Counsel for the applicant sought to withdraw this application. The permission to withdraw at this stage is rejected.

Ld. Counsel Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma has deliberately withheld the fact of filing and consequent dismissal of the first bail application in the present case and thereafter upon court query, has deliberately mentioned the application to be the first bail application with his initials in the title of the bail application. The conduct of Ld. Counsel Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma is unbecoming of an Advocate, which is a noble profession and this kind of forum hunting cannot be allowed. **Let a copy of this Order be sent to the President, Bar Council of Delhi and to Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi. Also, IO concerned is directed to mention the fact of filing of any previous bail application and its**



Contd....3/-

-3-

**results in his reply.**

Heard. Perused.

Although the fact that accused is required for TIP is in itself not a ground to dismiss bail, however, as per the report of IO, accused Mohit has been involved in as many as 17 other cases out of which 15 cases pertain to similar offences. Also, since the first bail application has already been dismissed and any change of circumstances does not find mention in this subsequent bail application. Accordingly, second application for grant of bail is hereby dismissed.

**Accordingly, bail application is disposed of.**

**Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent and IO concerned.**

**Let copy of this order be given dasti.**

**Let a copy of this Order be sent to the President, Bar Council of Delhi and to Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi.**

*Aakanksha*  
15/11/2020  
(Aakanksha)

Duty MM/West/Delhi/15.11.2020

**FIR No.799/2020**  
**PS: Punjabi Bagh**  
**State vs. Mohit**  
**u/s 356/379/34 IPC**

15.11.2020

**This is an application u/s 437 CrPC for grant of bail of accused Mohit.**

**Present:** None for the State.

Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused Mohit S/o Sankar Lal R/o B-2/430, Sultan Puri, Delhi.

Reply has been received from IO ASI Bijender Singh.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, he is in JC since 15.10.2020, accused belongs to poor strata of society, that every man is deemed to be innocent until found guilty, that he is ready and willing to join investigation as and when required, that he is on bail in all the other cases pending against him and that he be released on bail.

On the other hand, IO ASI Bijender Singh in his reply has objected to the release of accused on the ground that his judicial TIP is fixed for 19.11.2020.

Ld. Counsel for accused is posed a query by this Court as to whether the present bail application is first bail application or not, upon which he wrote first bail application on the application itself. At this stage, it is brought to the notice of undersigned by Ahlmad that IO ASI Bijender Singh has telephonically informed him that previous a bail application was filed in the present case even before, for which he had sent a reply on

Contd...2/-



-2-

10.11.2020. At this stage, Ld. Counsel for the accused submits that this is the first bail application which has been filed by Ld. Counsel and that he is not aware as to whether any other bail application was filed by some other counsel for the same accused in the said case and sought for five minutes to get it confirmed.

After five minutes, Ld. Counsel for the accused appeared and stated that **this is the second bail application and the previous one has already been dismissed by the concerned Court.** When the undersigned started dictating the said conduct, Ld. Counsel for the applicant sought to withdraw this application. The permission to withdraw at this stage is rejected.

Ld. Counsel Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma has deliberately withheld the fact of filing and consequent dismissal of the first bail application in the present case and thereafter upon court query, has deliberately mentioned the application to be the first bail application with his initials in the title of the bail application. The conduct of Ld. Counsel Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma is unbecoming of an Advocate, which is a noble profession and this kind of forum hunting cannot be allowed. **Let a copy of this Order be sent to the President, Bar Council of Delhi and to Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi. Also, IO concerned is directed to mention the fact of filing of any previous bail application and its**

Contd...3/-



-3-

**results in his reply.**

Heard. Perused.

Although the fact that accused is required for TIP is in itself not a ground to dismiss bail, however, as per the report of IO, accused Mohit has been involved in as many as 17 other cases out of which 15 cases pertain to similar offences. Also, since the first bail application has already been dismissed and any change of circumstances does not find mention in this subsequent bail application. Accordingly, second application for grant of bail is hereby dismissed.

**Accordingly, bail application is disposed of.**

**Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent and IO concerned.**

**Let copy of this order be given dasti.**

**Let a copy of this Order be sent to the President, Bar Council of Delhi and to Ld. District & Sessions Judge, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi.**

*Aakanksha*  
15/11/2020  
(Aakanksha)

Duty MM/West/Delhi/15.11.2020



**FIR No.883/2020**  
**PS: Punjabi Bagh**  
**u/s 33/38 Delhi Excise Act**  
**State vs. Fareed & Ors.**

15.11.2020

**This is an application u/s 437 CrPC for grant of bail of accused Fareed S/o Gulzar R/o Nathupura, Gali No.4, Burari, Delhi.**

**Present:** None for the State.

Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused Fareed S/o Gulzar R/o Nathupura, Gali No.4, Burari, Delhi.

Reply has been received from IO SI Harish Yadav.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, he is in JC since 12.11.2020, accused belongs to poor strata of society, that every man is deemed to be innocent until found guilty, that he is ready and willing to join investigation as and when required, that he is on bail in all the other cases pending against him and that he be released on bail.

On the other hand, IO SI Harish Yadav in his reply has objected to the release of accused on the ground that he is habitual offender and is a part of organized crime, having previous involvements and there is strong apprehension that if he is freed on bail he might jump bail.

Heard. Perused.

Keeping in view the overall facts & circumstances of the case and previous involvement of accused, he is reported to be involved two other case of which one pertains to similar offence, hence, **accused Fareed is admitted to bail on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/-**

Contd...2/-



-2-

**with one surety in the like amount subject to the satisfaction of Jail Superintendent/Duty MM, subject to conditions that :-**

1. He shall join the investigation as and when he is called upon by the IO.
2. He shall not tamper with evidence.
3. He shall appear before the court on each and every date of hearing.

**Accordingly, bail application is disposed of.**

**Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned.**

**Let copy of this order be given dasti.**

*Aakanksha*  
15/11/2020  
(Aakanksha)

Duty MM/West/Delhi/15.11.2020

FIR No.883/2020  
PS: Punjabi Bagh  
u/s 33/38 Delhi Excise Act  
State vs. Raj Kumar & Ors.

15.11.2020

**This is an application u/s 437 CrPC for grant of bail of accused Raj Kumar S/o Mohan Lal R/o Gali No.12, D-block, Kadi Vihar, Nathupura, Delhi.**

**Present:** None for the State.

Mr. Ajesh Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused Raj Kumar S/o Mohan Lal R/o Gali No.12, D-block, Kadi Vihar, Nathupura, Delhi.

Reply has been received from IO SI Harish Yadav.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, he is in JC since 12.11.2020, accused belongs to poor strata of society, that every man is deemed to be innocent until found guilty, that he is ready and willing to join investigation as and when required, that he is on bail in all the other cases pending against him and that he be released on bail.

On the other hand, IO SI Harish Yadav in his reply has objected to the release of accused on the ground that he is habitual offender and is a part of organized crime, having previous involvements and there is strong apprehension that if he is freed on bail he might jump bail.

Heard. Perused.

Keeping in view the overall facts & circumstances of the case and the fact that there is no previous involvement of accused as reported by

Contd...2/-

↓

-2-

IO, no purpose would be served by keeping the accused in custody, hence, **accused Raj Kumar is admitted to bail on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/- with one surety in the like amount subject to the satisfaction of Jail Superintendent/Duty MM, subject to conditions that:-**

1. He shall join the investigation as and when he is called upon by the IO.
2. He shall not tamper with evidence.
3. He shall appear before the court on each and every date of hearing.

**Accordingly, bail application is disposed of.**

**Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned.**

**Let copy of this order be given dasti.**

*Aakanksha*  
15/11/2020  
(Aakanksha)

Duty MM/West/Delhi/15.11.2020