

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

**Bail Application No.2120
FIR No.220/21
P.S. Khyala
u/s 33/38/58 of Delhi Excise Act
State Vs Gursharan Yadav**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

This is second application under section 438 Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of applicant/accused seeking anticipatory bail.

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

Mr. Mir Akhtar Hussain, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Heard. Record perused.

Counsel for applicant has submitted that the first anticipatory bail application of applicant was dismissed vide order dated 01.04.2021 passed by the court of Ms. Hemani Malhotra, learned ASJ, West, Tis Hazari. Counsel has mentioned that he could not trace the order of dismissal on the website of the court and, therefore, the same could not be place on record.

Since, the earlier anticipatory bail applications filed by the applicant was dismissed by Ms. Hemani Malhotra, learned ASJ vide order dated 01.04.2021, therefore, in view of the mandate of the Apex Court in *M/s Gati Limited Vs Nagarjan Piramiajee & Anr., Criminal Appeal No.870/2019 decided on 06.05.2019*, it would be expedient that this being successive anticipatory application be also heard by the same court. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application be put up before the court of Ms. Hemani Malhotra, learned ASJ, West District, who shall be holding the court in the same jurisdiction 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b02
93e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 17:11:30 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.414/20
P.S. Mundka
u/s 354 IPC &
Sec.12 of POCSO Act
State Vs Ikram Ansari**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

W/SI Lalita, the IO from P.S. Mundka.

Mr. Abhijit Bhagat, Counsel for applicant/accused from DLSA.

Reply of IO has been received.

Heard. Record perused.

In view of the above mentioned Office Order, the cases pertaining to POCSO Act, with regard to release of UTPs falling under the criteria of the recommendations of HPC Committee of the High Court of Delhi, needs to be considered by the senior most ASJ, West District. In these circumstances, the present application be put up before Mr. Pooran Chand, learned ASJ, West on 22.05.2021. Notice be also issued to the IO to join on the next date of hearing before the concerned court.

**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: 2021.05.21 14:52:21 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.337/18
P.S. Moti Nagar
u/s 323/354/363 IPC &
Sec. 10 of POCSO Act
State Vs Jitender**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Rajan Bhatia, Counsel for applicant/accused from DLSA.

Reply of SI Pooja Yadav has been received.

Heard. Record perused.

In view of the above mentioned Office Order, the cases pertaining to POCSO Act, with regard to release of UTPs as per the recommendations of HPC Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, needs be considered by the Senior most ASJ, West District. In these circumstances, the present application be put up before Mr. Pooran Chand, learned ASJ, West on 22.05.2021. Notice be also issued to the IO to join on the next date of hearing before the concerned court.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE,
ou=JUDICIARY, postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f38
7d9850686d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553,
cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 14:38:17 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.448/20
P.S. Moti Nagar
u/s 307/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act
State Vs Joginder Dubey**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Ms. Kanchan Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused from DLSA.

Reply of SI Naresh Kumar has been received.

Heard. Record perused.

As per the report filed today, the applicant has already been granted interim bail for 90 days vide order dated 15.05.2021 passed by Mr. Manish Gupta, learned ASJ. In these circumstances, the present application stands dismissed as infructuous.

**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: 2021.05.21 16:25:01 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.265/17
P.S. Munkda
u/s 302/396/412/120B/34 IPC
State Vs Jokhu Sahani**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

IO/Inspector Bishambar Dayal.

None for applicant/accused.

Reply of IO has been received.

None has appeared on behalf of applicant despite various calls since morning, however, no adverse order is being passed.

Put up for consideration on 02.06.2021.

**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: 2021.05.21 16:30:09 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.204/16
P.S. Patel Nagar
u/s 302/34 IPC
State Vs Kunal @Sunny**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Anil Basoya, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply of Inspector Rajeev Kumar, SHO P.S. Patel Nagar has been received.

Counsel has submitted that the applicant is in custody since 08.03.2016 and he be granted interim bail in view of the HPC guidelines. As per reply received today, the accused is involved in two other criminal cases.

The report from the jail authorities regarding conduct of the accused and status of other two criminal cases be called for the next date of hearing.

Put up for consideration 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d1
3b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 17:13:01 +05'30'
**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.16/20
P.S. Anand Parbat
u/s 498A/304B/34 IPC
State Vs Mahesh Pandey**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
IO/Inspector Dharmendra Kumar from P.S. Anand Parbat.
Mr. Inder Pal Khokhar, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply of IO has been received.

Arguments on this bail application heard. Record perused.

Counsel for applicant has submitted that the applicant is in custody since 24.01.2020 and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has mentioned that the charge sheet in this case has been filed and the custodial interrogation is not required. He has mentioned that applicant is a young boy of 27 years of age and he is the sole bread winner of his family. He has submitted that the applicant has no criminal antecedents. He has mentioned that the applicant be granted bail in view of the HPC guidelines and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions to be imposed, in case, he is granted bail in this case.

On the other hand, it is submitted from prosecution side that there are serious and specific allegations against the accused. It is submitted that the bail application of this applicant is already pending before the Hon'ble High Court which is now listed for 29.07.2021. It is submitted that the similar bail application of applicant has already been dismissed vide order dated 18.03.2021 passed by this court. It is submitted that the possibility of applicant fleeing away from the justice cannot be ruled out completely, in case, he is granted bail.

I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments. It is pertinent to

mention that in the present application the facts regarding pendency of bail application of applicant before the Hon'ble High Court on 29.07.2021 as well as the fact that the similar bail application of applicant was dismissed by this court vide order dated 18.03.2021 have been concealed. The present application does not mention these material facts. The concealment of the material facts in the bail application is unwarranted. The matter is under consideration before a superior court and same shall be considered on the date already fixed. Earlier bail application of the applicant has already been dismissed by this court vide order dated 18.03.2021 and since then there is no change in the circumstances. The applicant and deceased hail from the same native village. I find force in the submissions of prosecution that there is a strong likelihood that in case released on bail, applicant would try to influence material witnesses, who are also from his native village. At this stage, no ground is made out for releasing the applicant on bail. Hence, the present application stands dismissed.

A copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent concerned for information. The order be also uploaded on website in time.

**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: 2021.05.21 16:16:23 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.423/19
P.S. Moti Nagar
u/s 20 NDPS Act**

State Vs Mohd. Ali Hussain @Bantha

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

Mr. Deepak Ghai, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply of IO has been received.

Arguments on this interim bail application heard. Record perused.

The applicant is seeking interim bail for two months on the ground to attend the *Chaliswa* and *Rasam Pagdi* of his father and that he is not well. However, a perusal of record shows that the applicant has already been granted interim bail from 12.04.2021 to 18.03.2021 on the ground that his father was expired on 15.03.2021 and he had to attend his last rites. Now, again this interim bail application for two months has been filed. Record also shows that the applicant has enjoyed the liberty of interim bail for a long period on one ground or another. Further, as argued by the counsel for applicant to grant interim bail in view of HPC guidelines as the applicant is not erroneous as the cases pertaining to NDPS Act are not 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. The regular bail application of the applicant has already been dismissed by this court vide detailed order dated 30.04.2021 passed by this court. In these circumstances, I am not inclined to grant interim bail to applicant at this stage. Hence, the present application is hereby dismissed.

A copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent concerned for information. The order be also uploaded on the website in time.

**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: 2021.05.21 15:14:23 +05'30'
**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE**

West/ THC/ 21.05.2021

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

**FIR No.486/13
P.S. Tilak Nagar
u/s 302/201/120B/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act
State Vs Rajesh Singh Lamba @Pintoo
S/o Late Mr. Harpal Singh Lamba
R/o J-10/89, Rajouri Garden, Delhi.**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Mukesh Kalia, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply to this bail application filed by Inspector Mukesh Kumar.

Arguments on this bail application heard. Record perused.

Counsel for applicant has submitted that the applicant is in custody since 11.11.2012 and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has mentioned that the accused has no criminal antecedent and he is permanent resident of Delhi. He has submitted that the applicant is an asthmatic patient and this situation is vulnerable to Covid-19 virus prevailing these days. 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 fact that applicant is an asthmatic patient and 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, as well as 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 Rajesh Singh Lamba @Pintoo is admitted to interim bail for 90 days from the date of his release on furnishing of his personal bond in sum of ₹50,000/- 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 16:21:29 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.28/18
P.S. Moti Nagar
u/s 394/395/397/411/34 IPC
State Vs Rattan Singh Rainu**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
None for applicant/accused.

Reply of IO/SI Mahendra Kumar has been received.

None has appeared on behalf of applicant despite various calls since morning, however, no adverse order is being passed.

Put up for consideration on 01.06.2021.

**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: 2021.05.21 16:34:00 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.539/16
P.S. Rajouri Garden
u/s 302/34 IPC
State Vs Ravi @Ronit**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Nishant Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply of SI Sandeep Kumar has been received.

Heard. Record perused.

The bail application filed by counsel is not in a proper format and the same is not opening. Counsel undertakes to send the same in a proper PDF format.

As per the prosecution, the applicant is a desperate and habitual criminal and involved in five other criminal cases. Put up for consideration on 28.05.2021. In the meantime, the report from the jail authorities regarding medical condition and the conduct of the accused be called for the next date of hearing.

**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: 2021.05.21 16:55:20 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.455/18
P.S. Tilak Nagar
u/s 394/397 IPC & 25 Arms Act
State Vs Deva Rohit Kapoor**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Arvind Kumar Mishra, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply of SI Sachin Yadav has been received.

Counsel for applicant has prayed to keep this application pending for
14.06.2021. Adjournment sought is granted.

Put up for consideration on 14.06.2021, as prayed.

**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: 2021.05.21 16:59:54 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.09/21
P.S. Mundka
u/s 363/376 IPC &
Sec.6 of POCSO Act
State Vs Sandeep @Bhuna**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
W/SI Lalita, the IO from P.S. Mundka.
Mr. P.K. Singh, Counsel for applicant/accused.
Ms. Deepika Sachdeva, Counsel from DCW.

Reply of IO has been received. Heard. Record perused.

In view of practice directions issued by the High Court of Delhi, issue notice to the complainant/victim in the prescribed manner (through IO) to join through the VC on the next date of hearing. Copy of application and reply be also forwarded to the complainant/ Counsel.

Put up for consideration on 31.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE,
ou=JUDICIARY, postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9
850686d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553,
cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 15:05:50 +05'30'
**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

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

**FIR No.09/21
P.S. Mundka
u/s 363/376 IPC &
Sec.6 of POCSO Act
State Vs Sandeep @Bhuna**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
W/SI Lalita, the IO from P.S. Mundka.
Mr. P.K. Singh, Counsel for applicant/accused.
Ms. Deepika Sachdeva, Counsel from DCW.

Reply of IO has been received. Heard. Record perused.

In view of practice directions issued by the High Court of Delhi, issue notice to the complainant/victim in the prescribed manner (through IO) to join through the VC on the next date of hearing. Copy of application and reply be also forwarded to the complainant/ Counsel.

Put up for consideration on 31.05.2021.

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

**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.511/2019

State Vs Anil Kumar Chauhan

U/s 302/323/34 IPC

PS : Rajouri Garden

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Vinay Kumar Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused Anil Kumar Chauhan.

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

Report about the medical condition of the applicant/accused Anil Kumar Chauhan not received from the concerned Jail Superintendent. The concerned Jail Superintendent is directed to furnish/forward report about the medical condition of the applicant on or before next date of hearing.

Put up for report/arguments on 27.05.2021.

SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: cn=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY, postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e531a25687c1cc25d87f192df387d9850686e13b0293a0091936cc70a09f531,
en=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 16:38:58 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)

Vacation Judge/

Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),

Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi

21.05.2021

**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.348/2019
State Vs Anita
U/s 302/201/120B IPC
PS : Patel Nagar**

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Gaurav Bhatia, Counsel for applicant/accused Anita.

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

Counsel for the applicant/accused submits that he is seeking interim bail of the applicant on medical grounds.

Report about the medical condition of the applicant/accused Anita not received from the concerned Jail Superintendent. The concerned Jail Superintendent is directed to furnish/forward report about the medical condition of the applicant on or before next date of hearing.

Put up for report/arguments on 25.05.2021.

SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, ou=JUDICIARY, postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=65581a22687f1cc25d97e1926f87d988068ed1380295e091936cc7e0d9953,
cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 18:37:22 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)

Vacation Judge/
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.28/2018

State Vs Arun Kumar @ Bhola

U/s 392/397/34 IPC

PS : Nangloi

21.05.2021

This is interim bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/ accused Arun Kumar @ Bhola.

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
None for applicant/accused Arun Kumar @ Bhola.

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 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 18:42:40 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Vacation Judge/
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

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

**FIR No.430/16
P.S. Tilak Nagar
u/s 302/34 IPC
State Vs Chirag**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
Mr. Suraj Prakash Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply to this bail application filed by Inspector Mukesh Kumar.

Arguments on this bail application heard. Record perused.

Counsel for applicant has submitted that the applicant is in custody since the year 2016 and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has mentioned that the accused has no criminal antecedent and he is permanent resident of Delhi. 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. She has mentioned that the applicant was duly identified in the CCTV footage. She 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 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, as well as 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 Chirag is admitted to interim bail for 90 days from the date of his release on furnishing of his personal bond in sum of ₹50,000/- 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 16:18:57 +05'30'

(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021

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

**FIR No.646/14
P.S. Munkda
u/s 302 IPC
State Vs Deva Ram**

21.05.2021

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, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

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

Present : Ms. Sweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.
IO/Inspector Bishambar Dayal.
Mr. Vinay Kumar, Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply of IO has been received.

Counsel has submitted that the applicant is in custody since June, 2015 and he be granted interim bail in view of the HPC guidelines.

The report from the jail authorities regarding conduct of the accused be called for the next date of hearing.

Put up for consideration 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d1
3b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 16:53:10 +05'30'

**(SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK)
ASJ/ VACATION JUDGE
West/ THC/ 21.05.2021**

**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.297/2017

State Vs Jasmeet Singh @ Ginni

U/s 365/ 302/201/34 IPC

PS : Khyala

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Vikas Chadha, Counsel for applicant/accused Jasmeet Singh @ Ginni.

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

Arguments on interim bail application heard. I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments.

1. The applicant/accused Jasmeet Singh @ Ginni seeks interim bail on the ground that he is covered under the guidelines/criteria laid down by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the recent meetings held on 04th & 11th May, 2021.
2. The applicant/accused is facing trial for committing offence under Section 365/ 302/201/34 IPC and he is in custody since 22.09.2017. Record reveals that on earlier occasion, applicant/accused was admitted to interim bail in view of the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the year 2020.
3. No previous involvement has been alleged or proved against the applicant/

accused.

4. 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/accused Jasmeet Singh @ Ginni 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 Jasmeet Singh @ Ginni R/o 3/47, New Moti Nagar, Delhi is admitted to interim bail for a period of ninety days from the date of his release subject to furnishing of a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Superintendent.
5. The bail is subject to the condition that applicant shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the court and shall provide his active mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO. Applicant shall surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent on expiry of interim bail period. Applicant is also directed to keep his mobile phone active on all the time. With these directions, bail application stands disposed off.
6. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent through email for information and compliance.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE,
ou=JUDICIARY, postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d98506
86d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 20:41:52 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.2118/2021
FIR No.209/2021
State Vs Manjeet Singh @ Manjeet Kumar
U/s 420/188/34 IPC, 3/7 Essential
Commodities Act & 3 Epidemic Act
PS : Rajouri Garden**

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh.Vikas Jain, Counsel for applicant/accused Manjeet Singh @
Manjeet Kumar.

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

Arguments on 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 03.05.2021 and no purpose would be served by keeping him further detained in custody. Counsel has submitted that investigation in the present matter already stands concluded and keeping the applicant further detained in custody would amount to pre-trial punishment. He has mentioned that he has nothing to do with the alleged offence and he was not even present at the spot at the time of alleged offence. Counsel has argued that applicant/accused was lifted from the house of co-accused Heera Singh but the

police has shown that he was arrested from the spot. He has mentioned that recovery has been planted upon the applicant by the police officials of local police station. Counsel has contended that only one oxygen cylinder was recovered from the possession of the applicant as the same was procured for the wife of co-accused Hira Singh, who was COVID-19 positive. He has submitted that co-accused Hira Singh has already been released on interim bail and on the ground of parity, the applicant is also entitled to be released on bail. Counsel has contended that applicant is not involved in the business of black-marketing and he has been falsely implicated by the police officials of local police station. Besides this, counsel has submitted that if the applicant is not granted regular bail, he may be considered for interim bail on ground of COVID-19 pandemic emergency in the country. Counsel has contended that applicant has large family to support including his three years old daughter. 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 Manjeet Singh @ Manjeet Kumar may be released on bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 420/188/34 IPC, 3/7 Essential Commodities Act & 3 Epidemic Act have been leveled against the applicant. He has submitted that during COVID-19 pandemic situation, applicant involved himself in the business of black-marketing of oxygen cylinders and he was found in possession of three oxygen cylinders. He has contended that applicant does not fall under the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic as these offences have been excluded by the Committee. He has mentioned that there is every likelihood that applicant might influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on bail.

I have gone through the record in the light of respective arguments. Applicant/accused is stated to be in custody since 03.05.2021 and allegations under Section 420/188/34 IPC, 3/7 Essential Commodities Act & 3 Epidemic Act have been leveled against the applicant. It is the case of prosecution that taking advantage of the situation that emerged on account of second wave of COVID-19 pandemic, applicant was found doing black-marketing of oxygen cylinders and as many as three oxygen cylinders were recovered from his possession. 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 not covered under the aforesaid guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of Delhi High Court as the Committee has categorically excluded the category of persons involved in hoarding of medicines and essential commodities. In recent times, the hoarding and black marketing of oxygen cylinders created a havoc in the pandemic and resulted in death of various persons, who could not get timely supply of oxygen. On the one hand, people were dying because of lack of oxygen while on the other hand, persons like the applicant were profiting by hoarding and black marketing oxygen cylinders. Such persons deserve no sympathy and a message needs to be given in the society that persons dealing in such activities shall be dealt with iron hand. Keeping in view the gravity and seriousness of offence, at this stage, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused Manjeet Singh @ Manjeet Kumar. Bail application stands dismissed.

**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: 2021.05.21 12:26:48 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
ASJ/Vacation Judge
(West District), Tis Hazari Courts, Delh
21.05.2021

**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 :

Anticipatory Bail Application No.2121

FIR No.28/2021

State Vs Om Dhingra

U/s 420/467/468/471/34/120B IPC

PS : Crime Branch

21.05.2021

This is anticipatory bail application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/ accused Om Dhingra.

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
IO/Insp. Satish Malik is present.
Sh. Rakesh Burman, Counsel for applicant/accused Om Dhingra.

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

Arguments on anticipatory bail applications 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 by the police officials at the instance of complainant. He has mentioned that applicant is a permanent resident of Delhi and he is 72 years old. He has submitted that applicant has deep roots in society and he is not involved in any other criminal case. Counsel has contended that the name of the applicant does not figure in the FIR and the Investigating Officer intends to arrest the applicant only to falsely implicated him in the present case. Counsel has submitted that one of the co-accused is the son-in-law of the applicant and the applicant had monetary

transactions with him but he was not aware at any point of time that the amount transferred in his bank account was ill-gotten money. Counsel has mentioned that applicant used to regularly received and give money to his son-in-law through bank accounts and these transactions were not connected with the alleged offence. He has contended that applicant never asked his son-in-law(co-accused) as to from where the money is being procured. He has mentioned that applicant was totally unaware of the fact that his son-in-law had cheated banks. Counsel has contended that the only allegations against that applicant are that his son-in-law transferred a sum of Rs.12.85 lakh in his bank account from a fictitious bank account but there is no incriminating evidence to connect him with the alleged conspiracy. He has submitted that applicant is the sole bread earner of his family and his family would suffer, if he is arrested. Counsel has stated that applicant is ready and willing to join investigation, if any. On the force of these submissions, counsel has prayed that the applicant may be admitted to anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that applicant and other accused persons have cheated various banks by securing and misappropriating loans obtained by them on the basis of forged sale-deeds. She has contended that applicant along with other accused persons have cheated banks to the tune of Rs.5.48 crores. She has mentioned that applicant received a sum of Rs.12.85 lakhs in bank accounts from a fictitious bank account opened by the co-accused. He has argued that accused persons hatched a conspiracy and prepared various forged sale deeds and got them registered from the office of Sub-Registrar by impersonating the owner of the property. He has mentioned that after getting the forged sale-deeds registered, the accused persons obtained loan from various banks by submitting these forged documents and siphoned off the loan amount. He has argued that the applicant is evading the process of law and avoiding his arrest. He has mentioned that custodial interrogation of the applicant is required to recover the cheated amount and to unearth the conspiracy. Besides this, it has been argued by Addl. Public

Prosecutor that investigation is at initial stage and releasing the applicant on anticipatory bail would prejudice the investigation. He has submitted that allegations under Section 420/467/468/471/34/120B IPC have been leveled against the applicant and considering the gravity of offence, at this stage, no ground is made out for admitting the applicant on anticipatory bail. He has contended that there is strong apprehension that applicant would tamper with the evidence and influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on anticipatory bail.

I have gone through the record in the light of respective arguments. Allegations under Section 420/467/468/471/34/120B IPC have been leveled against the applicant. It has been alleged that the accused persons hatched a conspiracy and prepared forged documents of the property of complainant, who is a senior citizen. In order to give genuine colour to these forged documents, the accused persons got these documents registered at the office of Sub-registrar by impersonating a person as the complainant. Once the documents were registered, the accused persons used the forged documents to obtain loan from various banks and thereafter, they misappropriated the disbursed loan amount by transferring the amount in other bank accounts. It has been alleged that accused persons have committed fraud to the tune of Rs.5.48 crores upon various banks by obtaining loans from them on the force of forged sale-deeds. Investigating officer has submitted that the applicant is the beneficiary of the transaction and he had received a sum of Rs.12.85 lakhs in his bank accounts from a fictitious bank account opened by the co-accused. The applicant is evading the process of law and he has not joined investigation. Prosecution has submitted that there is prima-facie evidence to demonstrate that the sale deeds were forged and a fictitious person was produced at the office of sub-registrar. I am of the view that in the present matter, custodial interrogation of the applicant is required to unearth the conspiracy. The possibility of complicity of bank officials also can not be ruled out. Recovery of the cheated amount is to be made and the trail of the siphoned funds needs to be ascertained. I find force in the submissions of the

prosecution that investigation is at initial stage and releasing the applicant on anticipatory bail would prejudice the investigation. There is strong apprehension that applicant would tamper with the evidence and influence the witnesses, in case, he is released on anticipatory bail. Even otherwise, anticipatory bail is an extraordinary remedy that needs to be granted only in those cases where the circumstances warrants the granting of the remedy to meets the end of justice. In view of the totality of circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that this is not a fit case for exercising the discretion vested under Section 438 Cr.P.C. Accordingly, anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of applicant/accused Om Dhingra stand 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686
d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 14:24:59 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Vacation Judge/
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.1180/2020
State Vs Ravi Sahani
U/s 354/506/509/34 IPC
PS : Nangloi**

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
None for applicant/accused Ravi Sahani.

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 31.05.2021.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICIARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b
0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 12:33:00 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Vacation Judge/
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.326/2016

State Vs Salman @ Riyazuddin

U/s 302/307/452/427/147/148/149/120B/34 IPC

PS : Vikaspuri

21.05.2021

This is an interim bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/accused Salman @ Riyazuddin S/o Alauddin R/o Jhuggi No.106, Indira Camp No.4, Vikaspuri, Delhi.

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Naveen Kohar, Counsel for applicant/accused Salman @ Riyazuddin.

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

Arguments on interim bail application heard. I have perused the record in the light of respective arguments.

1. The applicant/accused Salman @ Riyazuddin seeks interim bail on the ground that he is covered under the guidelines/criteria laid down by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the recent meetings held on 04th & 11th May, 2021.
2. The applicant/accused is facing trial for committing offence under Section 302/307/452/427/147/148/149/120B/34 IPC and he is in custody since 01.04.2016. Record reveals that on earlier occasion, applicant/accused was admitted to interim bail in view of the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the year 2020.

3. No previous involvement has been alleged or proved against the applicant/accused.
4. 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/accused Salman @ Riyazuddin 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 Salman @ Riyazuddin S/o Alauddin R/o Jhuggi No.106, Indira Camp No.4, Vikaspuri, Delhi is admitted to interim bail for a period of ninety days from the date of his release subject to furnishing of a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Jail Superintendent.
5. The bail is subject to the condition that applicant shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the court and shall provide his active mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO. Applicant shall surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent on expiry of interim bail period. Applicant is also directed to keep his mobile phone active on all the time. With these directions, bail application stands disposed off.
6. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent through email for information and compliance.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE, ou=JUDICARY,
postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d985068
6d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 19:09:29 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.45/2019

State Vs Shiv Kumar @ Sibba

U/s 356/392/394/364/506/411/120B

PS : Moti Nagar

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
IO/SI Pramod is present.
Sh. Pawan Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused Shiv Kumar @ Sibba.

Reply to the bail application has been forwarded by the Investigating Officer. Be taken on record. Copy be supplied to the counsel for the applicant/acused.

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 31.05.2019 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 04.05.2021 and 11.05.2021. He has contended that applicant is involved in only one case bearing FIR No.136/2019 registered at PS

Civil Lines, Gurugram (Haryana) and he has been acquitted in the said case. 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 Shiv Kumar @ Sibba may be released on interim bail.

On the other hand, Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application mentioning that allegations under Section 356/392/394/364/506/411/120B have been leveled against the applicant. She has submitted that applicant does not fall under the guidelines issued by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on COVID-19 pandemic as he is found to be involved in three other criminal cases of similar nature.

I have gone through the record in the light of respective arguments. Applicant/accused is in custody since 31.05.2019 and allegations under Section under Section 356/392/394/364/506/411/120B have been leveled against him. Investigating Officer has furnished report mentioning that applicant/accused Shiv Kumar @ Sibba is involved in as many as three other criminal cases of similar nature. Details of these cases have been mentioned in the report. It appears that accused is earning his livelihood by resorting to kidnapping for ransom, robbery and dacoity, Keeping in view the gravity/seriousness of offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused Shiv Kumar @ Sibba. 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d
13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 19:05:31 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.1468 of 2021

FIR No.47/2021

State Vs Sonu @ Vicky

U/s 326 IPC & 25/27/54/59 Arms Act

PS : Anand Parbat

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. A.K.Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused Sonu @ Vicky.

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

First bail application of the applicant was dismissed on 26.03.2021.

Arguments on second 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 11.03.2021 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 nothing incriminating was recovered from his possession. He has argued that there is an inordinate delay in registration of FIR and this delay has not been explained by the prosecution. 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 contended that there is no evidence on record to connect the applicant with the alleged offence. Counsel has submitted that he is also seeking bail on behalf of the applicant on the ground of COVID-19 pandemic emergency in the country. 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. He has mentioned 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 326 IPC & 25/27/54/59 Arms Act have been leveled against the applicant. He has contended that applicant is also involved in another criminal case bearing FIR No.132/2020 registered under Section 436/147/148/149/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act at PS Anand Parbat. He has argued that applicant caused grievous injuries on the complainant with knife and the said knife has also been recovered at his instance. Besides this, Addl. Public Prosecutor has argued that although, charge-sheet in the present matter has been filed in the court but charges are yet to be framed. He has mentioned 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 under Section 326 IPC & 25/27/54/59 Arms Act have been leveled against the applicant. It is the case of prosecution that a scuffle took place between the applicant and the complainant and during that scuffle, complainant took out a knife and caused grievous injuries to the complainant. Record shows that weapon of offence was recovered at the instance of the applicant. Investigating Officer has submitted report that applicant is involved in another criminal case bearing FIR No.132/2020 registered under Section

436/147/148/ 149/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act at PS Anand Parbat. Although, charge-sheet in the present matter has 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. Keeping in view the gravity/seriousness of offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/accused Sonu @ 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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f3
87d9850686d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553,
cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 12:17:13 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)

Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),

Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi

21.05.2021

**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.511/2019
State Vs Sunil Kumar
U/s 302/323/34 IPC
PS : Rajouri Garden**

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Vinay Kumar Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused Sunil Kumar.

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

Report about the medical condition of the applicant/accused Sunil Kumar not received from the concerned Jail Superintendent. The concerned Jail Superintendent is directed to furnish/forward report about the medical condition of the applicant on or before next date of hearing.

Put up for report/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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f
S.S. SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 18:34:46 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Vacation Judge/
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.511/2019
State Vs Sushil @ Kallu
U/s 302/323/34 IPC
PS : Rajouri Garden**

21.05.2021

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

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Sh. Vinay Kumar Sharma, Counsel for applicant/accused Sushil @ Kallu.

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

Report about the medical condition of the applicant/accused Sushil @ Kallu not received from the concerned Jail Superintendent. The concerned Jail Superintendent is directed to furnish/forward report about the medical condition of the applicant on or before next date of hearing.

Put up for report/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=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d9850686d13b0293e0091936
cc7e0b9f553, cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)

Vacation Judge/
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021

**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.2213/2021
FIR No.410/2017
State Vs Tajinder Singh Walia
U/s 498A/406/34 IPC
PS : Rajouri Garden**

21.05.2021

This is anticipatory bail application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C on behalf of applicant/ accused Tajinder Singh Walia.

Present : - Ms. Shweta Verma, Substitute Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
Applicant/accused Tajinder Singh Walia is present.

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

At this stage, applicant/accused submits that the matter has been amicably settled with the complainant before Mediation Cell and the terms of settlement are being finalized. He further submits that the matter is now listed before the Mediation Cell on 09.06.2021.

Put up for consideration on 17.06.2021. Court notice be issued to the complainant for the said date.

**SUDHANSHU
KAUSHIK**

Digitally signed by SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
DN: c=IN, o=DISTRICT AND SESSION JUDGE,
ou=JUDICARY, postalCode=110017, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=e65b1a25687c1cc25d97e1926f387d98
50686d13b0293e0091936cc7e0a9f553,
cn=SUDHANSHU KAUSHIK
Date: 2021.05.21 12:15:47 +05'30'

(Sudhanshu Kaushik)
Addl. Sessions Judge (West District),
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.05.2021