

FIR No.161/21  
PS. Patel Nagar  
U/s. 379/511/34 IPC  
State Vs. Kapil

21.05.2021

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Accused produced after fresh arrest.

Arrest memo seen.

MLC of the accused seen which shows injuries.

Sh. S. S. Malik, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

IO SI Neeraj Choudhary in person.

IO has moved an application for 14 days JC remand of the accused.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for accused has moved an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail to the applicant. It is submitted that the accused/applicant is falsely implicated in this case.

Reply for the bail has been filed by the IO.

Per contra, Ld. APP has opposed the application stating that the accused may commit the same offence if release on bail.

Arguments heard. Application and reply perused.

In view of the arguments submitted by Ld. Counsel for accused and the facts on record for the present case. It is unlikely that the accused will flee from justice and evade appearance before the court. In view of the current extraordinary pandemic situation, I deem it fit to admit the accused on bail on fulfilling the following conditions:

1. That he shall not indulge into similar offence or any offence in the event of release on bail.
2. That he shall not tamper with the evidences in any manner.

f

3. That in case of change of his residential address, he shall intimate the court about the same, and
4. That he shall regular appear before this court on each and every date of hearing.
5. Accused shall furnish Bail bond and surety bond for the sum of Rs.20,000/- with one surety in like amount.

Copy of order be supplied to the counsel for accused through electronic mode.

Application be disposed of accordingly.

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021

*Order copy  
Received  
SS. Malik  
21-5-21*



FIR No.02512/21

PS. Kirti Nagar

U/s. 379/411 IPC

State Vs. Vlkash

21.05.2021

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Sh. Rajender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply has been filed by the IO.

Ld. Counsel for accused has moved an application for grant of regular bail to the applicant. It is submitted that the accused/applicant is falsely implicated in this case and is sole bread earner of his family.

Per contra, Ld. APP has opposed the application stating that the accused may commit the same offence if release on bail.

Arguments heard. Application and reply perused.

In view of the arguments submitted by Ld. Counsel for accused and the facts on record for the present case. It is unlikely that the accused will flee from justice and evade appearance before the court. In view of the current extraordinary pandemic situation, I deem it fit to admit the accused on bail on fulfilling the following conditions:

1. That he shall not indulge into similar offence or any offence in the event of release on bail.
2. That he shall not tamper with the evidences in any manner.
3. That in case of change of his residential address, he shall intimate the court about the same, and
4. That he shall regular appear before this court on each and every date of hearing.
5. Accused shall furnish Bail bond and surety bond for the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety in like amount.

Copy of order be supplied to the counsel for accused through electronic mode.

Application be disposed of accordingly.

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021

*Copy  
filed  
OK  
9810495 244*



FIR No.734/2020

PS. Rahhola

U/s. 420/120-B IPC

State Vs. Md. Akbar Khan

21.05.2021

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Sh. Yogesh Kumar Gahlot, Ld. Counsel for the accused(through CISCO Webex).

An application for interim bail of the accused has been moved.

Reply to the interim bail application received from IO. Reply perused.

Arguments heard on interim bail application from both sides.

Ld. Counsel for accused submits that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case. Ld. Counsel for accused further submits that the co-accused has already been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

IO has strongly opposed the bail application and submitted that the offence is serious in nature and applicant/accused Md. Akbar Khan induced the complainant to get a government job in railway from Ministers Quota without any exam and demanded Rs. 12 lakhs. Complainant paid Rs. 12 Lakhs to the accused and when complainant forced accused for return of her money, accused threatened complainant for dire consequences.

As per the previous conviction slip submitted by the IO, no previous involvement of the accused is found.

In view of the guidelines of High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the interim bail application is allowed subject to the condition that applicant/accused will appear and mark his attendance in PS Ranhola once every 14 days for next three months. If the applicant/accused fails to mark his



attendance in PS once every 14 days for next three months, his interim bail will be reconsidered and may be cancelled, on the report of concerned SHO.

Applicant/accused is admitted to interim bail for period of three months on furnishing of personal bond of Rs. 30,000/- to the satisfaction of Jail Superintendent on the following conditions.

(i) The applicant/accused shall not attempt to contact, threaten or otherwise influence the complainant.

(ii) The applicant/accused shall maintain good and peaceful behaviour.

(iii) The applicant/accused shall give his address to the IO and if he changes the address he shall intimate the same to the IO.

(iv) The applicant/accused is directed to attend all the hearings.

The applicant/accused shall surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent on expiry of interim bail of three months or on whichever is earlier.

The application is disposed of.

Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent concerned for intimation.

Copy of this order be also sent to the IO and Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused as prayed for.

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021

FIR No.212/2021

PS. Moti Nagar

U/s. 354/354-B/186/353/332/188/269/323/506/509/34 IPC

State Vs. Amit Kumar & ors.

21.05.2021

**This is application for release of mobile i.e. VIVO X60 8/128 Midnight Black Colour on behalf of the applicant.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Sh. Ashok Gupta, Ld. Counsel for applicant alongwith applicant.

At request, be put up for consideration before the court concerned  
on 28.05.2021.



(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021



FIR No.449/21

PS. Punjabi Bagh

U/s. 33/38/58 Delhi Excise Act & 188/269/270 IPC

State Vs. Pankaj Arora

21.05.2021

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Accused produced after one day PC remand.

IO SI Sumit Dhankhar in person.

Sh. S. S. Malik, Ld. Counsel for accused.

MLC seen with the remarks no fresh injuries.

IO has moved an application for 14 days Judicial Custody of the accused.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for the accused has moved an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C for grant of bail and requested that the application may be treated as application for interim bail for 90 days in view of the directions of High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 04.05.2021.

In view of the guidelines of High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the interim bail application is allowed subject to the condition that applicant/accused will appear and mark his attendance in PS Punjabi Bagh once every 14 days for next three months. If the applicant/accused fails to mark his attendance in PS once every 14 days for next three months, his interim bail will be reconsidered and may be cancelled, on the report of concerned SHO.

Applicant/accused is admitted to interim bail for period of three months on furnishing of personal bond of Rs. 10,000/-. Personal bond furnished and accepted.

Sumit  
SI Sumit  
Punjabi Bagh

(i) The applicant/accused shall maintain good and peaceful behaviour.

The applicant/accused shall surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent on expiry of interim bail of three months or on whichever is earlier.

The application is disposed of.

Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent concerned for intimation.

Copy of this order be also sent to the IO and Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused as prayed for.

*Order copy  
Received  
S. S. Malik*

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021



FIR No.81/2021

PS. Crime Branch

U/s. 420/188 IPC & 3 Epidemic Disease Act

State Vs. Ashwani

21.05.2021

**This is application for grant of bail on behalf of the accused/applicant Ashwani.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Sh. Kartik Dabas, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Reply has been filed by the IO.

Ld. Counsel for accused has moved an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail to the applicant.

IO in his reply submits that the accused could not be given regular bail as he is involved in black marketing of Remdesivir Injection and allegations are serious in nature.

Ld. Counsel for accused submits that single vial of Remdesivir vaccine was recovered from the accused. It is further argued that the accused is falsely implicated in the case and further no recovery is required in the present case. He further argues that no purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars and he is in JC since 02.05.2021.

Ld. APP for accused vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the allegations are serious in nature and accused may commit same offence if released on bail.

Arguments heard and perused.

It is well settled law that general rule of bail and not the jail as the exception where bail is the right of the accused. However, right of the accused must be balanced with the interest of the society and fairness of investigation. In



the present case, accused is in JC since 02.05.2021 and no evidence of hoarding has been produced by the IO and only one vaccine of Remdesivir was recovered.

Ld. Counsel for accused submitted medical documents of the wife and the father of the accused which shows that wife is suffering from Covid-19 and the possibility of vial of remdesivir was for his wife cannot be ruled out. Ld. Counsel further submits that his father is also suffering from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and the accused is sole bread earner of his family.

Keeping in view the above stated facts and circumstance, I deem it fit to admit the accused on bail on fulfilling the following conditions:

1. That he shall not indulge into similar offence or any offence in the event of release on bail.
2. That he shall not tamper with the evidences in any manner.
3. That in case of change of his residential address, he shall intimate the court about the same, and
4. That he shall regular appear before this court on each and every date of hearing.
5. Accused shall furnish Bail bond and surety bond for the sum of Rs.15,000/- with one surety in like amount.

Copy of order be supplied to the counsel for accused and his counsel through electronic mode.

Application be disposed of accordingly.

Copy Received  
Kanti K. S.  
21/05/2021.  
@ 7.00 PM.

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021



FIR No.349/2021

PS. Mundka

U/s. 336/34 IPC & 27 Arms Act

State Vs. Surender @ Pappu & ors.

21.05.2021

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Accused persons namely Surender @ Pappu produced from two days PC remand.

Accused Sanjay produced after fresh arrest.

LAC could not be joined VC despite repeated efforts.

IO SI Rajbir Singh in person.

Arrest memos seen.

MLCs seen which shows no fresh injuries.

The factum of the arrest has been given to the mother of the accused Sanjay.

An application has been moved by SI Rajbir Singh for two days PC remand of the accused persons.

IO submits that two days more PC remand is requested as the co-accused Sanjay was arrested on the instance of the Surender and accused Surender is required to take Jhajjar Haryana to recover the weapon of offence and accused Sanjay is to be taken to the Meerut.

Keeping in view of the above, the accused is remanded for two days police custody as there are sufficient reasons for the same as to arrest the co-accused persons and recover the case property. IO is directed to get the accused medically examined as per the law.

Accused Surender and Sanjay be produced before the concerned court/Duty MM on 23.05.2021.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to the IO as prayed for.

(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021

File No. 20090021

PG. Number

Vol. 20090021 PC & 27 Arma. Act

21.08.2021

Present Lt. SP to the Inspector (DCC) (Muzumdar)

Accused Mahesh produced from ten days PC remand

LAC could not be joined as, despite repeated efforts

to be kept long a person.

to see that an application to 17 days J. of the accused in File

No. 20090021 PG Number

20.8.2021 case effect remains in final report

In view of the reasons stated in the application there are sufficient grounds that the accused persons may commit further offences. They may induce others to provide to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or to disclose the same from disclosing such facts to the courts or to the police officers and to conduct proper investigation of the offence.

Therefore, the accused person is recommended to J. of 17 days 20.08.2021.

Accused persons to produce before the concerned Court/Judge on 20.08.2021.

Copy of this order to given sent to the IC

(P. Muzumdar SP) (Muzumdar)  
Dy. Insp. (DCC) (Muzumdar)  
21.08.2021



FIR No.278/2021

PS. Mundka

U/s. 323/341/308/506/34 IPC

State Vs. Surender @ Pappu & ors

21.05.2021

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Accused persons produced from two days PC remand.

LAC could not be joined VC despite repeated efforts.

IO SI Rajbir Singh in person.

IO has filed an application for 14 days JC of the accused in FIR no.278/2021 PS Mundka.

MLC seen which remarks no fresh injuries.

In view of the reasons stated in the application there are sufficient grounds that the accused persons may commit further offence, they may induce, threat or promise to any person for acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the courts or to the police officers and to conduct proper investigation of the offence.

Therefore, the accused persons *in Mahair and Surender* are remanded to JC till 04.06.2021.

Accused persons be produced before the concerned Court/Duty MM on 04.06.2021.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the IO.

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021

FIR No.109/2021  
PS. Patel Nagar  
U/s. 392/411/34 IPC  
State Vs. Kundan

21.05.2021

Present : Ld. APP for the State(through CISCO Webex).

Sh. A. K. Ojha, Ld. Counsel for the accused.

An application u/s 437 Cr.P.C for grant of interim bail for period of 90 days of the accused has been moved.

Reply to the interim bail application received from IO. Reply perused.

Arguments heard on interim bail application from both sides.

Ld. Counsel for accused submits that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case.

IO has strongly opposed the bail application and submitted that the offence is serious in nature.

In view of the guidelines of High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the interim bail application is allowed subject to the condition that applicant/accused will appear and mark his attendance in PS Patel Nagar once every 14 days for next three months. If the applicant/accused fails to mark his attendance in PS once every 14 days for next three months, his interim bail will be reconsidered and may be cancelled, on the report of concerned SHO.

Applicant/accused is admitted to interim bail for period of three months on furnishing of personal bond of Rs. 20,000/- to the satisfaction of Jail Superintendent on the following conditions.





(i) The applicant/accused shall not attempt to contact, threaten or otherwise influence the complainant.

(ii) The applicant/accused shall maintain good and peaceful behaviour.

The applicant/accused shall surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent on expiry of interim bail of three months or on whichever is earlier.

The application is disposed off.

Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent concerned for intimation.

Copy of this order be also sent to the IO and Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused as prayed for.

I Receive daste Copy  
Asgha

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021



FIR No.109/2021

PS. Ranjit Nagar

U/s. 279/337 IPC

21.05.2021

***This is an application for releasing vehicle No. DL-1PC-6503 on superdari.***

Present:- Ld. APP for the State.

Applicant/Authorized person Sh. Ram Dhari Singh in person.

Sh. Ram Dhari Singh has provided the authority letter of company I.e. AB Grain Spirits Pvt. Ltd on his behalf. Same be taken on record.

Report has been filed on behalf of IO wherein he has no objection if the vehicle is released on superdari. Same be taken on record. Heard. Perused.

Instead of releasing the vehicle on superdari, I am of the considered view that the vehicle has to be released as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **Sunder Bhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujrat, AIR 2003 SC 638**. The view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been reiterated by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled as **Manjit Singh Vs. State in Crl. M.C. No. 4485/2013 dated 10.09.2014** wherein it has been held that :

*"1. Vehicles involved in an offence may be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle, valuation report, and a security bond.*

*2. The photographs of the vehicle should be attested countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.*

*3. The production of the vehicle should not be insisted upon during the trial. The panchnama and photographs along with the valuation report should suffice for the purposes of evidence.*

*4. Return of vehicles and permission for sale thereof should be the general norm rather than the exception.*

*5. If the vehicle is insured, the court shall issue notice to the owner and the insurance company for disposal of the vehicle. If there is no response or the owner declines to take the vehicle or informs that it has claimed insurance/released its right in the vehicle to the insurance company and the insurance company fails to take possession of the vehicle,*





the vehicle may be ordered to be sold in auction.

6. If a vehicle is not claimed by the accused, owner, or the insurance company or by a third person, it may be ordered to be sold by auction."

Considering the facts and circumstances and law laid down by higher courts, vehicle No. **DL-1PC-6503** in question be released to the **rightful/registered owner** on furnishing security bond as per valuation report of the vehicle. After preparation of panchnama of the vehicle and furnishing of security bond as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court, the vehicle shall be released by the IO.

Panchnama and valuation report shall be filed in the court alongwith charge sheet. Copy of this order be given dasti to applicant.

  
(P. BHARGAV RAO)  
DutyMM-II/WEST/DELHI  
21.05.2021

Received

  
D.B. Singh