

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. Alam Ansari @ Alam Khan
FIR No. : 200/18
P.S.: Nihal Vihar
U/s 376 IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Rajender Prasad Sarvan, Ld. Counsel for the
accused/applicant.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.
SI Sangeeta in person.
Naib Court Ankit Dahiya.

I.A. : 03/20

Arguments heard. Put up for orders.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

ORDER:

The brief facts of the case are that the complainant made a written complaint on 12.04.2018 wherein she alleged that on since 13.03.2018 she had come to Delhi for working as a domestic help and used to reside with accused. It is further alleged that on the same day in the morning accused was heavily drunk and called her in his room,

when she refused accused took her forcibly, closed the door and committed rape upon her. After a while the wife of the accused tried to save the prosecutrix by banging the door. The moment the door was opened Accused started beating his wife. The wife of the accused took the girl to the police station and thereafter on her complaint the present FIR was registered.

Ld. Legal Aid Counsel has argued that there is a delay in registration of the FIR. The time of incident as mentioned in the Tehrir and as mentioned in the MLC is different. It is submitted that no explanation has come forward from the prosecution for delay in registration of the FIR. It is also argued that there are contradictions in the statement of the victim as recorded in the Asal Tehrir and in the statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C. Lastly it is argued that accused is in custody since July, 2018, therefore, bail should be granted to the accused.

On the other hand Ld.Addl.PP for the State has argued that it is the wife of the accused who has taken the prosecutrix to the police station. This in itself shows that accused was the person who had committed the offence. The evidence is yet to be recorded and the last bail application of the accused was dismissed on 30.06.2020 and as such there is no change in the circumstances since then.

I have heard Ld. Counsel for the accused and Ld. Addl. PP for the State and have perused the record.

In the present case last bail application of the accused was dismissed on 30.06.2020, there is no change in the circumstances since then. Even otherwise at the stage of granting bail it would not be appropriate for this court to analysis the time of incident thread bear. The victim in Asal Tehrir stated that the time of incident was in the morning, in the MLC she has stated that exact time to be 11:30 am.

At this stage I do not see any contractions neither it can be said that there is a delay which would entitle the accused to grant of bail. The application for bail is dismissed. I.A. stands Disposed off.

Copy of the order be sent to the Jail Superintendent and Ld. Counsel for the accused through electronic mode.

Nothing said herein shall tantamount to an opinion on the merits of the case. The observations if any have been made for the purpose of deciding the present bail application. Put up on the date already fixed.

ANKUR JAIN

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:31:00
+05'30'

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs Shyam Kishan Pal
FIR No. : 102/19
P.S.: Maya Puri
U/s : 376/376D/354B/354/341/323 IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

Bail bond taken up in terms of Circular No. 26-DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 1977-2009/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020.

Present: Sh. Satish Kmar, Ld. Counsel for the accused Munna Lal along with surety Vikas.

Verification report has been received. It be taken on record.

Report perused. Bail bond accepted. Original FDR be retained. Robkar be issued. Release warrant be sent.

ANKUR JAIN

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 14:34:16 +05'30'

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs Ajay @ Aju & Ors.
FIR No. : 279/17
P.S.: Kirti Nagar
U/s : 328/342/365/376D/506 IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

Bail bond taken up in terms of Circular No. 26-DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 1977-2009/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020.

Present: Sh. Satish Chander, Ld. Counsel for the accused Pawan Saini along with surety Sudhir Saini.

Verification report has been received. It be taken on record.

Report perused. Bail bond accepted till 14.09.2020. Original

RC is retained. Robkar be issued. Release warrants be sent.

ANKUR JAIN

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 14:35:42 +05'30'

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

SC No. : 576/19
State Vs Deepak Kumar
FIR No. : 334/19
P.S.: Nangloi
U/s. : 376D/328/384/506/34 IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Kuldeep Mansukhani, Ld. Counsel for the
accused/applicant.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Ahlmad has made a report that inadvertently he had given two I.A. numbers i.e. 4 and 5 in respect of the bail application of accused Naveen Goyal. I.A. number be corrected and or be deleted in the system.

I.A. NO. 06/20

Reply on behalf of the IO filed. Copy is stated to have been received by the counsel for the accused/applicant, complainant as well as by the Addl. PP for the State.

I have perused the report. As per the report Smt. Deepa is residing at Delhi and is also working as a Staff Nurse in Deep Chand Bandhu hospital. The report, reflects that her duty timings are from 8:00 am to 2:00 pm. She is having

three children and is living alone.

Ld. Counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail application on the ground that accused had violated the conditions and has visited his village, he submits that this fact can be verified from the IO. Admittedly, the accused has not caused any problem to the complainant and therefore, considering the family circumstances as noted above, without going into the merits of the case the interim bail of accused stands extended for a period of 45 days from today. I.A No. 06/20 stands disposed off.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent for information, to Ld counsel for the complainant and Ld. Counsel for the accused through electronic mode.

Put up for the date already fixed i.e. 22.10.2020.

ANKUR JAIN

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:03:12 +05'30'

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

FIR NO 112/19

PS Ranjit Nagar

State V D.K.Sharma @Bunty Sharma

Hearing took place through CISCO Web Ex.

10.08.2020

File is taken up for hearing in terms of circular no. 26-DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 499/11885-11919/ Misc. / Gaz. /DJ West/ 2020 dated 31.07.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Accused absent
Ms. Arti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

The case is listed for PE. Ahlmad of this court has informed that Id Counsel cannot join the proceedings as he is unable to download Cisco Web Ex. In terms of the advisory issued by the Honble DHC adverse order is deferred.

Put up on 14.10.2020

ANKUR JAIN

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:33:53 +05'30'

(Ankur Jain)

Addl. Sessions Judge (SFTC-01) West
Delhi:10.08.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

FIR NO 155/18

PS Hari Nagar

State V D.K.Sharma @Bunty Sharma
Dikarika Sharma

Hearing took place through CISCO Web Ex.

10.08.2020

File is taken up for hearing in terms of circular no. 26-DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 499/11885-11919/ Misc. / Gaz. /DJ West/ 2020 dated 31.07.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Accused not produced from JC
Ms. Arti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.
Sh. Vipin Mishra Ld Counsel for the Accused.

The case is listed for PE. In terms of the directions contained in the above said circular evidence cannot be recorded. Accordingly, the present case is adjourned.

Let Production Warrants be issued against the accused. In case the Court reopens accused shall be produced physically otherwise through VC. Put up on 02.09.2020

ANKUR JAIN
(Ankur Jain)

Addl. Sessions Judge (SFTC-01) West
Delhi:10.08.2020

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:32:55 +05'30'

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs Diwakar Bhatti
FIR No. : 30/18
P.S.: Patel Nagar
U/s : 376/506/313/174-A IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

File taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 26-DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 1977-2009/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Vaibhav Jain, Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Matter is listed for charge, however, persual of the file shows that charge has already been framed.

In terms of the directions as contained in the above said circular evidence cannot be recorded. Accordingly, the present case is adjourned.

Put up for PE on **19.01.2021.**

ANKUR JAIN

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:06:27 +05'30'

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

SC No. :11/17
State Vs Roshal Lal
FIR No. : 184/14
P.S.: Maya Puri

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

File taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 26-DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 1977-2009/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. R.N. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant.
Accused is absent.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Ld. Counsel for the accused submits that accused could not join the proceedings as he was under the impression that only counsels have to join, he submits that if court directs the accused can come to the court on any given date.

Case is listed for PE. In terms of the directions as contained in the above said circular evidence cannot be recorded.

Let prosecutrix be summoned for the next date of hearing through SHO/IO concerned.

Put up for PE on **18.01.2021.**

ANKUR JAIN

(Ankur Jain)

ASJ (SFTC-01) West

Delhi: 10.08.2020

Digitally signed by ANKUR
JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:05:21
+05'30'

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs Satvinder Singh
FIR No. : 150/19
P.S.: Nihal Vihar
U/s : 376/328/506 IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

File taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 26-DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 1977-2009/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Vikas Rohtagi, Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Matter is listed for PE. No PW is present.

In terms of the directions as contained in the above said circular evidence cannot be recorded. Accordingly, the present case is adjourned.

Put up for PE on **18.01.2021.**

ANKUR JAIN Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:04:08 +05'30'
(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. Alam Ansari @ Alam Khan
FIR No. : 200/18
P.S.: Nihal Vihar
U/s 376 IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

10.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Rajender Prasad Sarvan, Ld. Counsel for the
accused/applicant.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.
SI Sangeeta in person.
Naib Court Ankit Dahiya.

I.A. : 03/20

Arguments heard. Put up for orders.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020

ORDER:

The brief facts of the case are that the complainant made a written complaint on 12.04.2018 wherein she alleged that on since 13.03.2018 she had come to Delhi for working as a domestic help and used to reside with accused. It is further alleged that on the same day in the morning accused was heavily drunk and called her in his room,

when she refused accused took her forcibly, closed the door and committed rape upon her. After a while the wife of the accused tried to save the prosecutrix by banging the door. The moment the door was opened Accused started beating his wife. The wife of the accused took the girl to the police station and thereafter on her complaint the present FIR was registered.

Ld. Legal Aid Counsel has argued that there is a delay in registration of the FIR. The time of incident as mentioned in the Tehrir and as mentioned in the MLC is different. It is submitted that no explanation has come forward from the prosecution for delay in registration of the FIR. It is also argued that there are contradictions in the statement of the victim as recorded in the Asal Tehrir and in the statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C. Lastly it is argued that accused is in custody since July, 2018, therefore, bail should be granted to the accused.

On the other hand Ld.Addl.PP for the State has argued that it is the wife of the accused who has taken the prosecutrix to the police station. This in itself shows that accused was the person who had committed the offence. The evidence is yet to be recorded and the last bail application of the accused was dismissed on 30.06.2020 and as such there is no change in the circumstances since then.

I have heard Ld. Counsel for the accused and Ld. Addl. PP for the State and have perused the record.

In the present case last bail application of the accused was dismissed on 30.06.2020, there is no change in the circumstances since then. Even otherwise at the stage of granting bail it would not be appropriate for this court to analysis the time of incident thread bear. The victim in Asal Tehrir stated that the time of incident was in the morning, in the MLC she has stated that exact time to be 11:30 am.

At this stage I do not see any contractions neither it can be said that there is a delay which would entitle the accused to grant of bail. The application for bail is dismissed. I.A. stands Disposed off.

Copy of the order be sent to the Jail Superintendent and Ld. Counsel for the accused through electronic mode.

Nothing said herein shall tantamount to an opinion on the merits of the case. The observations if any have been made for the purpose of deciding the present bail application. Put up on the date already fixed.

ANKUR JAIN

Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN
Date: 2020.08.10 15:31:00
+05'30'

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 10.08.2020