

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

**In the matter of :
FIR No.1398/2015
State Vs Abhishek
U/s 302 IPC
PS : Uttam Nagar**

17.05.2021

This is an interim bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Abhishek.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Chetan Pangasa, Counsel for applicant/accused Abhishek.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record.

Arguments on interim bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

Counsel for the accused/applicant has argued that accused is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has mentioned that applicant is in custody since 27.10.2015 and no purpose would be served by keeping him further detained in custody. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that he does not intend to argue on the merits of the present case. He has mentioned that he is seeking interim bail of the applicant on ground of COVID-19 pandemic emergency in the country. Counsel has mentioned that accused/applicant is covered under the category/guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic vide minutes dated 05.05.2021 and 11.05.2021. Counsel has mentioned that on earlier occasion, applicant was granted interim bail vide order dated

22.04.2020 passed by the court of Sh. Vishal Singh, Ld. ASJ in view of the guidelines issued by the High Power Committee of High Court of Delhi in the year 2020. He has submitted that applicant has duly complied with the said order and timely surrendered before the concerned Jail Superintendent. He has contended that applicant has deep roots in society with no previous criminal record. Counsel has mentioned that applicant is ready and willing to comply with any directions/conditions that may be imposed upon him. On the force of these submissions, prayer has been made that applicant Abhishek may be released on interim bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 302 IPC have been leveled against the applicant. He has submitted that there is every likelihood that applicant might flee from the process of law, in case, he is released on bail.

I have gone through the record in the light of respective arguments. Applicant/accused is in custody since 27.10.2015 and allegations under Section 302 IPC have been leveled against him. Investigating Officer has submitted report that applicant is not involved in any other criminal case. Counsel has submitted that on earlier occasion, applicant was granted interim bail vide order dated 22.04.2020 passed by the court of Sh. Vishal Singh, Ld. ASJ in view of the guidelines issued by the High Power Committee of High Court of Delhi in the year 2020. Copy of said order has been annexed with the bail application. I have perused the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic vide minutes dated 04.05.2021 and 11.05.2021. Applicant is covered under the aforesaid guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of Delhi High Court. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances, without going into the merits of the case and considering the present situation of COVID-19 pandemic, applicant/accused Abhishek is admitted to interim bail for a period of four weeks from the date of his release subject to furnishing of a personal bond for a sum of Rs.30,000/- to the

satisfaction of concerned Jail Superintendent. The bail is subject to the condition that applicant would not, in any manner, try to contact the victim and her family members and he would not leave the station without seeking permission from the court. On the expiry of the period of interim bail, the applicant/accused shall surrender before the Jail Superintendent. With these directions application stands disposed off.

Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent through email for compliance.

SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b0293
e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:12:38 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)

Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),

Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi

17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

Bail Application No.1434/2021

FIR No.1141/2020

State Vs Samsuddin

U/s 392/397/411 IPC

PS : Nangloi

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Samsuddin.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
None for applicant/accused.

Reply to the bail application forwarded by the Investigating Officer is already on record.

None has appeared on behalf of applicant/accused despite repeated calls since morning. The matter stands adjourned. No adverse orders are being passed.

Put up for consideration/arguments on 27.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:33:50 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

Bail Application No.2049/2021

FIR No.60/2021

State Vs Amit Kumar

U/s 25/54/59 Arms Act

PS : Moti Nagar

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Amit Kumar.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
None for applicant/accused.

Reply to the bail application forwarded by the Investigating Officer is already on record.

None has appeared on behalf of applicant/accused despite repeated calls since morning. The matter stands adjourned. No adverse orders are being passed.

Put up for consideration/arguments on 28.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686
d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:34:48 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

**In the matter of :
Bail Application No.2051/2021
FIR No.255/2021
State Vs Raj Babu Mishra
U/s 420/120B IPC
PS : Nangloi**

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Raj Babu Mishra.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
None for applicant/accused.

Reply to the bail application forwarded by the Investigating Officer is already on record.

None has appeared on behalf of applicant/accused despite repeated calls since morning. The matter stands adjourned. No adverse orders are being passed.

Put up for consideration/arguments on 19.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICIARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686
d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:35:24 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

FIR No.122/2020

State Vs Gaurav @ Yadav Ji

U/s 392/397/411 IPC

PS : Patel Nagar

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Gaurav @ Yadav Ji.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
None for applicant/accused.

Reply to the bail application forwarded by the Investigating Officer is already on record.

None has appeared on behalf of applicant/accused despite repeated calls since morning. The matter stands adjourned. No adverse orders are being passed.

Put up for consideration/arguments on 29.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686
d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:36:26 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

FIR No.77/2017

State Vs Deepak Jha @ Ravi

U/s 376 IPC & 6 POCSO Act

PS : Anand Parbat

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Deepak Jha @ Ravi.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Ms. Deepika Sachdeva, Counsel for victim from DCW.
None for applicant/accused.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record.

None has appeared on behalf of applicant/accused despite repeated calls since morning. The matter stands adjourned. No adverse orders are being passed.

Put up for consideration/arguments on 31.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b0
293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:37:17 +05'30'

**(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**FIR No.348/19
P.S. Patel Nagar
u/s 302/201/120B IPC
State Vs Anita**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

This is an application under section 439 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of applicant/accused seeking interim bail on medical grounds.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

Mr. Gaurav Bhatia, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply to this bail application filed by the IO.

Heard. Record perused.

The report from the concerned Jail Superintendent regarding present medical condition of the accused be called for the next date of hearing.

Put up for consideration on 21.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686
d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 14:46:26 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**FIR No.57/11
P.S. Khyala
u/s 302/364/365/201/379 IPC
State Vs Arvind Azad**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

This is an application under section 439 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of applicant/accused seeking interim bail for 90 days.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. K. Singhal, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply to this bail application filed by the IO.

Arguments on this bail application heard. Record perused.

Counsel for applicant has submitted that the applicant is in custody since 17.04.2011 i.e. for the last more than nine years. He has mentioned that accused has been falsely implicated in this case. He has mentioned that earlier vide order dated 28.05.2020, the applicant was granted interim bail in this case and he did not misuse the liberty of interim bail and duly surrendered in the jail in time. He has mentioned that the family of accused is facing undue hardship due to his continuous detention. He has mentioned that the accused has no criminal antecedent. He has mentioned that applicant be granted interim bail for 90 days as he is covered under the criteria laid down by the High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the recent meetings held on 04th & 11th May, 2021.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor for State has vehemently opposed this interim bail application stating that there are serious and specific allegations of murder against the accused. He has submitted that the possibility of applicant fleeing away from the justice cannot be ruled out completely, in case, he is granted interim bail at this stage.

I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments. Without going into the merits of the case, keeping in view the criteria laid down by the High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the recent meetings held on 04th & 11th May,

2021, and the fact that entire India is engulfed in the ambit of second wave of Covid-19, which according to medical and expert opinion is more virulent and fatal than the previous strain, the accused Arvind Azad is admitted to interim bail to interim bail for 90 days from the date of his release on furnishing of his personal bond in sum of ₹30,000/- to be furnished before the Jail Superintendent concerned, subject to the condition that he shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the court and shall provide his active mobile number to the IO/SHO concerned with direction to surrender before the Jail Superintendent concerned in time after expiry of interim bail period. He is also directed to keep his mobile phone on all the time. With this, the application stands disposed off.

A copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent concerned for information to the accused as well as be sent to Counsel for accused through email.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686
d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 16:34:05 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**FIR No.293/18
P.S. Patel Nagar
u/s 394/397/511/120B IPC
State Vs Jatin Verma**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

This is an application under section 439 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of applicant/accused seeking interim bail for 90 days.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Nitin Bajpai, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply to this bail application filed by the IO.

Arguments on this bail application heard. Record perused.

Counsel for applicant has submitted that the applicant is in custody since 21.10.2018 and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has mentioned that the co-accused Umesh and Dheeraj have already been granted bail in this case. He has mentioned that the charge sheet in this case has already been filed which is pending before the court of Mr. Pooran Chand, learned ASJ. He has mentioned that the regular bail application of the applicant is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and the same is now fixed for 06.07.2021. He has mentioned that earlier vide order dated 04.06.2020, the applicant was released on interim bail and he did not misuse the liberty of interim bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor for State has vehemently opposed this interim bail application stating that there are serious and specific allegations against the accused. He has submitted that the possibility of applicant fleeing away from the justice cannot be ruled out completely, in case, he is granted interim bail at this stage.

I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments. Without going into the merits of the case, keeping in view the fact that applicant did not misuse the liberty of interim bail granted to him earlier vide order dated 04.06.2020 as well as in view of the criterial laid down by the High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the

recent meetings held on 04th & 11th May, 2021, and the fact that entire India is engulfed in the ambit of second wave of Covid-19, which according to medical and expert opinion is more virulent and fatal than the previous strain, the accused is admitted to interim bail to interim bail for four weeks from the date of his release on furnishing of his personal bond in sum of ₹30,000/- to be furnished before the Jail Superintendent concerned, subject to the condition that he shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the court and shall provide his active mobile number to the IO/SHO concerned with direction to surrender before the Jail Superintendent concerned in time after expiry of interim bail period. He is also directed to keep his mobile phone on all the time. With this, the application stands disposed off.

A copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent concerned for information to the accused as well as be sent to Counsel for accused through email.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13
b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 15:56:43 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**Bail Applications No.2053, 2054, 2055 & 2056
FIR No.353/21
P.S. Tilak Nagar
u/s 498A/406/34 IPC
State Vs Palwinder Kaur, Amandeep Singh
Ashish Pal Kaur & Jagtar Singh**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

These are four connected applications under section 438 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of abovenamed applicants/accused seeking anticipatory bail.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
IO/ASI Shambu Dutt from P.S. Tilak Nagar.
Mr. Abhimanyu Tiwari, Counsel for applicants/accused.
Complainant Ms. Ishman Kaur.

Reply to this bail application filed by the IO. Heard. Record perused.

Complainant has submitted that the applicants are not willing to return her *stridhan* articles and they have given incorrect list of articles. She has further submitted that her husband has abandoned her and now he is staying in Australia.

At this stage, counsel for applicant has submitted that the applicants are ready to return the *stridhan* articles including gold ornaments, if any, to the complainant.

Applicants are directed to join the investigation and return the admitted *stridhan* articles of the complainant.

Put up for consideration on 01.06.2021. Till then no coercive steps be taken against the applicants/accused.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b0
293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 14:43:37 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**Bail Applications No.2053, 2054, 2055 & 2056
FIR No.353/21
P.S. Tilak Nagar
u/s 498A/406/34 IPC
State Vs Palwinder Kaur, Amandeep Singh
Ashish Pal Kaur & Jagtar Singh**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

These are four connected applications under section 438 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of abovenamed applicants/accused seeking anticipatory bail.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
IO/ASI Shambu Dutt from P.S. Tilak Nagar.
Mr. Abhimanyu Tiwari, Counsel for applicants/accused.
Complainant Ms. Ishman Kaur.

Reply to this bail application filed by the IO. Heard. Record perused.

Complainant has submitted that the applicants are not willing to return her *stridhan* articles and they have given incorrect list of articles. She has further submitted that her husband has abandoned her and now he is staying in Australia.

At this stage, counsel for applicant has submitted that the applicants are ready to return the *stridhan* articles including gold ornaments, if any, to the complainant.

Applicants are directed to join the investigation and return the admitted *stridhan* articles of the complainant.

Put up for consideration on 01.06.2021. Till then no coercive steps be taken against the applicants/accused.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b0
293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 14:43:37 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**FIR No.55/20
P.S. Nangloi
u/s 366A/376/506 IPC
State Vs Ranju & Poonam etc.**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

This is an application under section 439 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of applicant/accused seeking bail.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
None for applicant/accused.

Reply to this bail application filed by the IO. Heard. Record perused.

In view of the practice directions issued by the High Court of Delhi, issue notice of this bail application to the victim/complainant as well as to the IO with directions to join through the VC on the next date of hearing.

Put up for consideration on 27.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d1
3b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 14:50:00 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**FIR No.251/18
P.S. Mundka
u/s 376/452 IPC
State Vs Shiv Pujan Manji**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

This is an application under section 439 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of applicant/accused seeking interim bail on medical grounds.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

Mr. Pankaj Kumar Aggarwal, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Heard. Record perused.

Today neither the IO has joined nor the reply has been filed.

Issue notice to the IO to file the reply and to join through VC on the next date of hearing.

Put up for consideration on 19.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICIARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 16:37:04 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF MR. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK : ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
WEST DISTRICT : TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI.**

**Bail Application No.2048
FIR No.213/21
P.S. Khyala
u/s 25 Arms Act
State Vs Sonu @Shubham**

17.05.2021

The bail matters are being taken up during summer vacations through Video Conferencing due to alarming rise in Covid-19 cases in National Capital Territory of Delhi in compliance of Office Order No.447/10441-10481/S.V/Gaz/DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021 passed by learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, West District.

This is an application under section 439 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of applicant/accused seeking bail.

Present : Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Sandeep Rajput, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply to this bail application filed by the IO.

Arguments on bail application heard. Record perused.

Counsel for applicant/accused has submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in custody since 21.03.2021. He has submitted that the investigation in this case has been completed and the charge sheet has already been put to the court. He has mentioned that the co-accused Virender has already been granted bail in this case. He has submitted that nothing was recovered from the possession of the accused and the recovery has been planted upon him. He has mentioned that the accused is not a previous convict. He has submitted that applicant is ready and willing to comply with any condition that may be imposed upon him. On the force of these submissions, counsel has prayed that applicant may be released on bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that accused is a habitual offender and he is involved in 11 other criminal cases of different police stations. He has mentioned that there is strong likelihood that the accused may indulge in the similar offences, in case, he is released

on bail at this stage.

I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments. It is the case of prosecution that on 21.03.2021, on receipt of a secret information, accused along with his co-accused Virender was arrested near Gate no.2, Kesho Pur Mandi, Delhi and eight live cartridges were recovered from his possession. During investigation, it was revealed that the accused had stolen these live cartridges from Baba Hari Dass Nagar area. Considering the matter in totality, the period of custody as well as the facts that the investigation in this case has been completed and the co-accused has already been granted bail in this case, accused Sonu @Shubham is admitted to bail in this case on furnishing of his personal bond in sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of MM/ Link MM/ Duty MM and subject to the condition that he shall not indulge in any other criminal activity in future. Application stands disposed off.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 14:54:46 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 17.05.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

Bail Application Nos.1380 & 1395 of 2021

FIR No.341/2021

State Vs Dhanender Pratap Singh @ Vicky

U/s 147/148/149/186/308/347/353/506 IPC

PS : Khyala

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Dhanender Pratap Singh @ Vicky.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
IO/SI Nasib Singh is present.
Sh. Sanjeev Chaudhary, Counsel for applicant/accused Dhanender Pratap Singh @ Vicky.

Record perused. Record reveals that two similar bail applications have been filed on behalf of applicant/accused Dhanender Pratap Singh @ Vicky.

At this stage, counsel for the applicant submits that inadvertently, similar bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant. He seeks liberty to withdraw bail application No.1380/2021 filed on behalf of the applicant. Liberty sought is granted. Bail application No.1380/2021 stands dismissed as withdrawn.

Reply to the bail application forwarded by the Investigating Officer is already on record.

Arguments on bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

Counsel for the applicant/accused has argued that applicant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has contended that applicant is in JC since 14.04.2021 and no purpose would be served by keeping him further detained in custody as investigation already stands

concluded. He has mentioned that applicant has nothing to do with the alleged offence and even his name is not stated in the FIR. Counsel has contended that a scuffle took place between the victim (police personnel) and the applicant over some monetary issue and when applicant refused to give money to the victim, he falsely implicated him in the present case. Besides this, it has been argued by the counsel that applicant is a young boy of around 20 years of age and he has a large family to support. He has mentioned that applicant is the sole bread earner of his family and his family is facing undue hardship on account of his continuous detention. Counsel has submitted that applicant is ready and willing to comply with any condition that may be imposed upon him. On the force of these submissions, counsel has prayed that applicant may be released on bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 147/148/149/186/308/347/353/506 IPC have been leveled against the applicant. He has contended that applicant along with other co-accused persons inflicted grievous injuries on an on a police personnel, who was on duty. He has mentioned that the incident was captured by a public person on his mobile phone which clearly shows that accused persons gave merciless beating the police official. He has stated that bail applications of other accused persons have already been dismissed by the Sessions Court. Besides this, Addl. Public Prosecutor has argued that investigation of the present matter is at initial stage and releasing the applicant on bail would prejudice the investigation. He has contended that there is strong likelihood that applicant would influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on bail.

I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments. Allegations under Section 147/148/149/186/308/347/353/506 IPC have been leveled against the applicant. It is the case of prosecution that on 13.04.2021, on receiving complaint regarding a quarrel, SI Chote Lal reached the spot along with complainant and met the accused persons. It has been alleged that on seeing the police official at the spot, accused persons got furious and they gave merciless beating to him. Investigating Officer has forwarded a video clip which clearly shows that accused persons joined together and mercilessly beat the victim, who was an on-duty police official. It appears that applicant/accused is a fearless person, who assaulted an on duty police official, while he was performing his duty. I find force in the submissions of the prosecution that investigation of the

present matter is at initial stage and releasing the applicant on bail would prejudice the investigation. I also find force in the argument that releasing the applicant would send a wrong signal in society. There is strong likelihood that applicant would influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on bail. Keeping in view the gravity/seriousness of offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused Dhanender Pratap Singh @ Vicky. Bail application stands dismissed.

Copy of this order be sent on the email ID of the counsel for the applicant.

SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICIARY, postalCode=110017,
st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a
9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 13:49:48 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

Bail Application No.2050 of 2021

FIR No.213/2021

State Vs Mukesh Mehto

U/s 376D/376(2)(n)/342/506/509/120B/34 IPC

PS : Rajouri Garden

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Mukesh @ Mehto.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
IO/SI Madhuri is present.
Sh. Deepak Ghai, Counsel for applicant/accused Mukesh @ Mehto.

Reply to the bail application forwarded by the Investigating Officer is already on record.

Arguments on bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

Counsel for the applicant/accused has argued that applicant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has contended that applicant is in JC since 22.03.2021 and no purpose would be served by keeping him further detained in custody as investigation already stands concluded. He has mentioned that applicant has nothing to do with the alleged offence and no allegation has been leveled against him in the FIR. He has contended that the name of the applicant came only in the statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C and even in this statement, no allegation of rape has been leveled against the applicant. He has mentioned that the victim deposed in the statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C that she along with

co-accused Naveen Sharma stayed in the house of the applicant and apart from this, no other allegation has been leveled against him. Counsel has contended that victim was in live-in relationship with co-accused Naveen Sharma and she has been staying with him for the last more than two years. He has submitted that when victim came to know that co-accused Naveen Sharma is a married man, she falsely implicated him as well as the applicant in the present case. He has mentioned that only charges under Section 342/506 IPC are made out against the applicant. Counsel has submitted that charge-sheet in the present matter has already been filed and keeping the applicant further detained in custody would amount to pre-trial punishment. Counsel has submitted that applicant has deep roots in society with no previous criminal record. Besides this, it has been argued by the counsel that applicant has a large family to support and he is the sole bread earner in the family. He has mentioned that the family of applicant is facing undue hardship on account of his continuous detention. Counsel has submitted that applicant is ready and willing to comply with any condition that may be imposed upon him. On the force of these submissions, counsel has prayed that applicant may be released on bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 376D/376(2)(n)/342/506/509/120B/34 IPC have been leveled against the applicant. He has mentioned that admittedly, victim and co-accused Naveen Sharma were in live-in relationship and they were residing at H.No.145, Near Power House, Dwarka Mor, Delhi. He has mentioned that initially, victim and co-accused Naveen Sharma stayed at the house of the applicant at C-80, DDA Flats, Shivaji Enclave, Delhi. He has submitted that co-accused Naveen Sharma has repeatedly committed sexual intercourse with the victim on the pretext of marriage. He has contended that victim has categorically mentioned in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C that applicant aided co-accused Naveen Sharma by locking the door while she was being raped by him and thereafter, Section

342/120B IPC were added in the charge-sheet. Besides this, Addl. Public Prosecutor has argued that charge-sheet in the present matter has already been filed but charges are yet to be framed. He has contended that there is strong likelihood that applicant would influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on bail.

I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments. It is the case of prosecution that victim and co-accused Naveen Sharma were in live-in relationship for the last more than two years and they were residing at H.No.145, Near Power House, Dwarka Mor, Delhi. It has been alleged that co-accused Naveen Sharma made physical relations with the victim on multiple occasions on the false promise of marriage. During the course of investigation, statement of victim was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. Victim has mentioned in the said statement that initially, she along with co-accused Naveen Sharma stayed at the house of the applicant at Shivaji Enclave, Delhi where applicant assisted co-accused Naveen Sharma by locking the door while she was being raped by the co-accused. Although, charge-sheet in the present matter has been filed in the concerned court but charges are yet to be framed. I find force in the submissions of the prosecution that there is strong likelihood that applicant would influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on bail. Keeping in view the gravity of offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused Mukesh Mehto. Bail application stands dismissed.

Copy of this order be sent on the email ID of the counsel for the applicant.

SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b029
3e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 16:18:54 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

**In the matter of :
FIR No.250/2019
State Vs Pappu Kant
U/s 376 IPC & 6 POCSO Act
PS : Tilak Nagar**

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Pappu Kant.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Ms. Deepika Sachdeva, Counsel for victim from DCW.
Sh. Prem Kumar Bhardwaj, Counsel for applicant/accused Pappu Kant.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record.

Investigating Officer has mentioned in the report that the father of the prosecutrix has telephonically informed that presently, he is staying at his native place at Bihar and he is not in a position to join bail proceedings through video conferencing.

At this stage, counsel for the applicant has submitted that the father of the applicant has passed away on 12.05.2021 and prayed that the applicant may be released on interim bail so that he can perform last rites of his father. Investigating Officer is directed to verify the factum of death of father of the applicant and furnish report on or before next date of hearing.

Put up for report/arguments on 22.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 16:25:45 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

Bail Application No.2046 of 2021

FIR No.11/2021

State Vs Rohit @ Bala

U/s 302/307/324/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act

PS : Patel Nagar

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Rohit @ Bala.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Arun Kanojia, Counsel for applicant/accused Rohit @ Bala.

Reply to the bail application forwarded by the Investigating Officer is already on record.

Arguments on bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

Counsel for the applicant/accused has argued that applicant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has contended that applicant is in JC for the last five months and no purpose would be served by keeping him further detained in custody as investigation already stands concluded. He has mentioned that applicant has nothing to do with the alleged offence and nothing incriminating was recovered from his possession. He has mentioned that charge-sheet in the present matter has already been filed and keeping the applicant further detained in custody would amount to pre-trial punishment. Counsel has submitted that applicant has deep roots in society with no previous criminal record. Counsel has contended that other co-accused persons have already been released on bail and on the ground of parity, applicant

is also entitled to be released on bail. Besides this, it has been argued by the counsel that applicant has a large family to support and he is the sole bread earner in the family. He has mentioned that the family of applicant is facing undue hardship on account of his continuous detention. Counsel has submitted that applicant is ready and willing to comply with any condition that may be imposed upon him. On the force of these submissions, counsel has prayed that applicant may be released on bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 302/307/324/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act have been leveled against the applicant. He has contended that applicant along with three other accused persons stabbed three persons, out of them one expired. He has mentioned that there are four accused persons in the present case, out of them, three accused were found to be below 18 years of age and they were produced before the concerned JJB. He has mentioned that although, all the three CCL have been released by the concerned JJB but no parity can be drawn between the applicant and the CCL as the applicant was found to be more than 18 years of age. Besides this, Addl. Public Prosecutor has argued that charge-sheet in the present matter has already been filed but charges are yet to be framed. He has contended that there is strong likelihood that applicant would influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on bail.

I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments. Allegations under Section 302/307/324/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act have been leveled against the applicant and the applicant is in JC for the last five months. It is the case of prosecution that on 12.01.2021, applicant along with 'RS', 'R', 'D' & 'G' (CCL) stabbed three persons, out of them, one expired. There are four assailants in the present case and out of them, three assailants were found to be below 18 years of age and they were produced before the concerned JJB. Although, all the three CCL have been released by the concerned JJB but no parity can be drawn between the applicant and the CCL as the applicant was

found to be more than 18 years of age. Charge-sheet in the present matter has already been filed but charges are yet to be framed. I find force in the submissions of the prosecution that there is strong likelihood that applicant would influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on bail. Applicant is also not covered under the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. Keeping in view the gravity/seriousness of offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused Rohit @ Bala. Bail application stands dismissed.

Copy of this order be sent on the email ID of the counsel for the applicant.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICIARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686
d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 14:37:06 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

**In the matter of :
FIR No.551/2020
State Vs Sachin Jangra
U/s 394/397/307 IPC
PS : Tilak Nagar**

17.05.2021

This is an application filed on behalf of applicant/accused Sachin Jangra seeking extension of interim bail.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Rahul Kumar, Counsel for applicant/accused Sachin Jangra.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record.

Arguments on application seeking extension of interim bail heard through Video Conferencing.

Counsel for the accused/applicant has submitted that initially, applicant was granted interim bail vide order dated 19.04.2021 passed by the court of Sh. Manish Gupta, Ld. ASJ-4 (West). He has mentioned that thereafter, interim bail of the applicant was extended by the said court till 16.05.2021 as the applicant was found to be COVID-19 positive. Counsel has contended that on 16.05.2021, applicant could not surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent as he was again found COVID-19 positive vide report dated 13.05.2021. On the force of these submissions, counsel has prayed that interim bail of the applicant may be extended.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 394/397/307/34 IPC and

Section 27/54/59 Arms Act have been leveled against the applicant.

I have gone through the record in the light of respective arguments. Applicant is stated to on interim bail vide order dated 29.04.2021 passed by the court of Sh. Manish Gupta, Ld. ASJ-4 (West). The interim bail of the applicant was extended by the said court till 16.05.2021 as the applicant was found to be COVID-19 positive. Counsel has submitted that on 16.05.2021, applicant could not surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent as he was again found COVID-19 positive. Medical report of the applicant has been annexed with the application. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances, without going into the merits of the case and considering the present situation of COVID-19 pandemic, application seeking extension of interim bail stands allowed. Interim bail of applicant/accused Sachin Jangra is extended for further period of four weeks. The extension of interim bail is subject to the condition that applicant would not, in any manner, try to contact the victim and her family members and he would not leave the station without seeking permission from the court. On the expiry of the period of interim bail, the applicant/accused shall surrender before the Jail Superintendent. With these directions application stands disposed off.

Copy of this order be sent on the email ID of the counsel for the applicant.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d1
3b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 16:46:51 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

FIR No.104/2010

State Vs Sandeep @ Sonu

U/s 302/397/201/411/34 IPC

PS : Tilak Nagar

17.05.2021

This is an interim bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Sandeep @ Sonu.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Mahesh Patel, Counsel for applicant/accused Sandeep @ Sonu.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record.

Arguments on interim bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

Counsel for the accused/applicant has argued that accused is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has mentioned that applicant has remained in custody for more than nine years in the present case and no purpose would be served by keeping him further detained in custody. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that he does not intend to argue on the merits of the present case. He has mentioned that he is seeking interim bail of the applicant on ground of COVID-19 pandemic emergency in the country. Counsel has mentioned that accused/applicant is covered under the category/guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic vide minutes dated 05.05.2021 and 11.05.2021. Counsel has mentioned that on earlier occasion, applicant was

granted interim bail vide order dated 10.06.2020 passed by the court of Sh. Vishal Singh, Ld. ASJ in view of the guidelines issued by the High Power Committee of High Court of Delhi in the year 2020. He has submitted that applicant has duly complied with the said order and timely surrendered before the concerned Jail Superintendent. He has contended that applicant has deep roots in society with no previous criminal record. Counsel has mentioned that applicant is ready and willing to comply with any directions/conditions that may be imposed upon him. On the force of these submissions, prayer has been made that applicant Sandeep @ Sonu may be released on interim bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 302/397/201/411/34 IPC have been leveled against the applicant. He has submitted that there is every likelihood that applicant might flee from the process of law, in case, he is released on bail.

I have gone through the record in the light of respective arguments. Accused has remained in custody for more than nine years in the present case and allegations under Section 302/397/201/411/34 IPC have been leveled against him. Investigating Officer has submitted report that applicant is not involved in any other criminal case. Counsel has submitted that on earlier occasion, applicant was granted interim bail vide order dated 10.06.2020 passed by the court of Sh. Vishal Singh, Ld. ASJ in view of the guidelines issued by the High Power Committee of High Court of Delhi in the year 2020. Copy of said order has been annexed with the bail application. I have perused the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic vide minutes dated 04.05.2021 and 11.05.2021. Applicant is covered under the aforesaid guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of Delhi High Court. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances, without going into the merits of the case and considering the present situation of COVID-19 pandemic, applicant/accused Sandeep @ Sonu is admitted to interim bail for a period of four

weeks from the date of his release subject to furnishing of a personal bond for a sum of Rs.30,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Superintendent. The bail is subject to the condition that applicant would not, in any manner, try to contact the victim and her family members and he would not leave the station without seeking permission from the court. On the expiry of the period of interim bail, the applicant/accused shall surrender before the Jail Superintendent. With these directions application stands disposed off.

Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent through email for compliance.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

 Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d1
3b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:08:04 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

In the matter of :

FIR No.262/2014

State Vs Satish Kumar Yadav

U/s 365/302 IPC

PS : Uttam Nagar

17.05.2021

This is an interim bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Satish Kumar Yadav.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Sachin Kumar, Counsel for applicant/accused Satish Kumar Yadav.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record.

Arguments on interim bail application heard through Video Conferencing.

Counsel for the accused/applicant has argued that accused is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has mentioned that applicant is in custody since 06.06.2014 and no purpose would be served by keeping him further detained in custody. Counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that he does not intend to argue on the merits of the present case. He has mentioned that he is seeking interim bail of the applicant for a period of four weeks on ground of COVID-19 pandemic emergency in the country. Counsel has mentioned that accused/applicant is covered under the category/guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic vide minutes dated 05.05.2021 and 11.05.2021. He has contended that applicant has deep roots in society with no previous criminal record. Counsel has mentioned that applicant is ready and willing to comply with any directions/conditions that may be imposed upon him.

On the force of these submissions, prayer has been made that applicant Satish Kumar Yadav may be released on interim bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 365/302 IPC have been leveled against the applicant. He has submitted that there is every likelihood that applicant might flee from the process of law, in case, he is released on bail.

I have gone through the record in the light of respective arguments. Accused is in custody since 06.06.2014 and allegations under Section 365/302 IPC have been leveled against him. Investigating Officer has submitted report that applicant is not involved in any other criminal case. I have perused the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic vide minutes dated 04.05.2021 and 11.05.2021. Applicant is covered under the aforesaid guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of Delhi High Court. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances, without going into the merits of the case and considering the present situation of COVID-19 pandemic, applicant/accused Satish Kumar Yadav is admitted to interim bail for a period of four weeks from the date of his release subject to furnishing of a personal bond for a sum of Rs.30,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Superintendent. The bail is subject to the condition that applicant would not, in any manner, try to contact the victim and her family members and he would not leave the station without seeking permission from the court. On the expiry of the period of interim bail, the applicant/accused shall surrender before the Jail Superintendent. With these directions application stands disposed off.

Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent through email for compliance.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13
b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 16:22:36 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK :
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (WEST DISTRICT):
TIS HAZARI COURTS : DELHI**

In view of the directions issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (West) vide order No.447/10441-10481/S.V./Gaz./DJ West/2021 dated 15.05.2021, the matter is being taken up through Video Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX on account of COVID-19 pandemic emergency.

**In the matter of :
FIR No.415/2021
State Vs Tareena
U/s 14 Foreigners Act
PS : Khyala**

17.05.2021

This is bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Tareena.

Present : - Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Navneet Panwar, Counsel for applicant/accused Tareena.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record.

Investigating Officer has mentioned in the reply that applicant is a foreign national and investigation in the present matter is at initial stage.

At this stage, counsel for the applicant seeks liberty to withdraw the present bail application. Liberty sought is granted. Bail application stands dismissed as withdrawn.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE,
ou=JUDICARY, postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d985,
0686d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553,
cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.17 17:24:17 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.05.2021