

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, LD. CHIEF METROPOLITAIN  
MAGISTRATE, CENTRAL DISTRICT, TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**

**FIR No. 95/2018**

**PS: Crime Branch**

**State Vs. T. Khonkhe Rengma & Ors.**

**U/s. 420/120B IPC**

**Misc. Application**

**24.06.2020**

Present: Sh. Rajeev Kamboj, Ld. APP for the State has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.  
Sh. R.A. Worso Zimik, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.

Vide this order, I shall dispose off the application received through E-mail as moved on behalf of applicant/accused **T. Khonkhe Rengma** for seeking directions from this Court to de-freeze the Pension Salary Account no. 11826857444, at State Bank of India, Purana Bazar Branch, Naharbari, Dimapur, Nagaland, belonging to applicant/accused.

Reply to the said application has been received from the IO through E-mail.

Ld. Counsel for the accused has contended that the accused had been living off on monthly basis salary which was deposited in his SBI account no. 11826857444 Purana Bazar Branch, Naharbari, Dimapur, Nagaland. It has further been contended that the account has been frozen since November 2019 and the accused is suffering great hardship on this account.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has opposed the application as per law.

Submissions heard. Reply of IO perused.

A perusal of the record reveals that it is a case of inducement of innocent persons by opening fake marriage proposal account in a matrimonial website, whereby the complainant was induced to transfer money in various accounts.

However, a perusal of the reply of the IO would reveal that the applicant/accused is on Court bail, and there is no requirement of pension account of further investigation. IO had further raised no objection if pension account of the applicant/accused is de-frozen.

Accordingly, it is hereby directed that Manager State Bank of India, Purana Bazar Branch, Naharbari, Dimapur, Nagaland shall de-freeze the Pension Bank Account no. 11826857444 belonging to applicant/accused T. Khonkhe Rengma, S/o T. Sekham, R/o House No. 334, Purana Bazar B, Dimapur, Nagaland.

The application stands disposed off accordingly.

A copy of this order be sent to the IO on his E-mail ID for compliance. A order be also uploaded on the District Courts website forthwith.

**(Arul Varma)**  
**CMM (Central), Delhi**  
**24.06.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, LD. CHIEF METROPOLITAIN  
MAGISTRATE, CENTRAL DISTRICT, TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**

**FIR No. 145/2019**

**PS: Crime Branch**

**State Vs. Tarsem Singh**

**U/s. 419/420/468/471/474/170/120-B IPC**

**Bail Application**

**24.06.2020**

Present: Sh. Rajeev Kamboj, Ld. APP for the State has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.  
Sh. Yashaswi S.K. Chocksey, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.

Vide this order, I shall dispose off the application under Section 437 Cr.P.C received through E-mail as moved on behalf of applicant/accused Tarsem Singh for grant of interim bail.

Reply to the said application has been received from the IO through E-mail.

Ld. Counsel for the accused has contended that mother of the applicant/accused is seriously ill and needs for undergo an operation for removing gall bladder stone. It has further been contended that since mother of the applicant/accused is an aged lady, and it is the only the applicant/accused herein who can assist to get her admitted in the hospital for her treatment.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the application as per law. Ld. APP has invited the Court's attention to the application of accused Tarsem Singh, especially the medical slip, to contend that no emergent case is made out for release of the accused on interim bail.

Submissions heard. Reply of IO perused.

A perusal of the record reveals that a prescription slip of BJRM Hospital, Jahangirpuri, Delhi has been attached with the application for interim bail, however, there

is no mention of the fact that the mother of the applicant/accused is suffering from any ailment, nor has any diagnosis been made that the mother of the applicant/accused has to undergo an operation immediately.

Thus, considering the above circumstances, the ground of interim bail is not made out. Accordingly, the application moved on behalf of applicant/accused Tarsem Singh for interim bail stands dismissed.

Copy of this order be uploaded on the District Courts website forthwith. Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary intimation to the accused via official email ID.

**(Arul Varma)**  
**CMM (Central), Delhi**  
**24.06.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, LD. CHIEF METROPOLITAIN  
MAGISTRATE, CENTRAL DISTRICT, TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**

**FIR No. 113/2016**

**PS: Economic Offence Wing (Central)**

**State Vs. Avdhesh Kumar Goel**

**U/s. 420/406/409/120-B IPC**

**Misc. Application**

**24.06.2020**

Present: Sh. Rajeev Kamboj, Ld. APP for the State has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.  
Sh. Keshav Saini and Yash Varma, Ld. Counsels for applicant/accused have been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.

Vide this order, I shall dispose off the application received through E-mail as moved on behalf of applicant/accused Avdhesh Kumar Goel for release of the accused on personal bonds, and for giving directions to the Jail Superintendent to accept uncertified copies of bail orders whereby the accused was enlarged of bail orders. Ld. Counsel for the accused has contended that the accused is languishing in Jail as the Superintendent of Tihar Jail has refused to accept personal bonds.

Reply to the said application has been received from the IO through E-mail.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the application as per law.

Submissions heard. Reply of IO perused.

A perusal of the record reveals that accused was granted bail by the Ld. Sessions Court. A perusal of the reply would also reveal that the applicant/accused has concealed material facts in as much as that application for modification of bail orders on similar grounds were dismissed on 12.06.2020 by the Ld. ASJ. Moreover, the accused did not fulfill the conditions of bail namely deposit of passport.

Without going into the merits of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that it does not have the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the present complaint as the bail

orders were passed by the Ld. Sessions Court. Merely because the bonds had to be furnished before this Court, in the perception of this Court, that alone would not confer jurisdiction to this Court to entertain the present complaint. Since the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court have passed successive directions for relaxation of conditions of furnishing surety and has mandated that under trials be released upon furnishing of personal bonds, it is for the concerned Jail Authorities to comply with the same. The Jail Authorities are well within their rights to satisfy themselves about the veracity of bail orders passed by the Courts. In the present case also, it has been averred that Jail Superintendent has sought to peruse certified copies of bail orders passed qua the accused. Since this Court has not passed order on bail, no further action is required to be taken by this Court. The applicant/accused is at liberty to move appropriate forum for redressal of his grievances.

The application is therefore dismissed.

Copy of this order be uploaded on the District Courts website forthwith.  
Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary intimation to the accused via official email ID.

**(Arul Varma)**  
**CMM (Central), Delhi**  
**24.06.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, LD. CHIEF METROPOLITAIN  
MAGISTRATE, CENTRAL DISTRICT, TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**

**FIR No. 111/2016**

**PS: Economic Offence Wing (Central)**

**State Vs. Avdhesh Kumar Goel**

**U/s. 420/406/409/120-B IPC**

**Misc. Application**

**24.06.2020**

Present: Sh. Rajeev Kamboj, Ld. APP for the State has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.  
Sh. Keshav Saini and Yash Varma, Ld. Counsels for applicant/accused have been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.

Vide this order, I shall dispose off the application received through E-mail as moved on behalf of applicant/accused Avdhesh Kumar Goel for release of the accused on personal bonds, and for giving directions to the Jail Superintendent to accept uncertified copies of bail orders whereby the accused was enlarged of bail orders. Ld. Counsel for the accused has contended that the accused is languishing in Jail as the Superintendent of Tihar Jail has refused to accept personal bonds.

Reply to the said application has been received from the IO through E-mail.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the application as per law.

Submissions heard. Reply of IO perused.

A perusal of the record reveals that accused was granted bail by the Ld. Sessions Court. A perusal of the reply would also reveal that the applicant/accused has concealed material facts in as much as that application for modification of bail orders on similar grounds were dismissed on 12.06.2020 by the Ld. ASJ. Moreover, the accused did not fulfill the conditions of bail namely deposit of passport.

Without going into the merits of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that it does not have the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the present complaint as the bail

orders were passed by the Ld. Sessions Court. Merely because the bonds had to be furnished before this Court, in the perception of this Court, that alone would not confer jurisdiction to this Court to entertain the present complaint. Since the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court have passed successive directions for relaxation of conditions of furnishing surety and has mandated that under trials be released upon furnishing of personal bonds, it is for the concerned Jail Authorities to comply with the same. The Jail Authorities are well within their rights to satisfy themselves about the veracity of bail orders passed by the Courts. In the present case also, it has been averred that Jail Superintendent has sought to peruse certified copies of bail orders passed qua the accused. Since this Court has not passed order on bail, no further action is required to be taken by this Court. The applicant/accused is at liberty to move appropriate forum for redressal of his grievances.

The application is therefore dismissed.

Copy of this order be uploaded on the District Courts website forthwith.  
Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary intimation to the accused via official email ID.

**(Arul Varma)**  
**CMM (Central), Delhi**  
**24.06.2020**



**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, LD. CHIEF METROPOLITAIN  
MAGISTRATE, CENTRAL DISTRICT, TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**

**FIR No. 43/2016**

**PS: Economic Offence Wing (Central)**

**State Vs. Avdhesh Kumar Goel**

**U/s. 420/406/409/120-B IPC**

**Misc. Application**

**24.06.2020**

Present: Sh. Rajeev Kamboj, Ld. APP for the State has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.  
Sh. Keshav Saini and Yash Varma, Ld. Counsels for applicant/accused have been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.

Vide this order, I shall dispose off the application received through E-mail as moved on behalf of applicant/accused Avdhesh Kumar Goel for release of the accused on personal bonds, and for giving directions to the Jail Superintendent to accept uncertified copies of bail orders whereby the accused was enlarged of bail orders. Ld. Counsel for the accused has contended that the accused is languishing in Jail as the Superintendent of Tihar Jail has refused to accept personal bonds.

Reply to the said application has been received from the IO through E-mail.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the application as per law.

Submissions heard. Reply of IO perused.

A perusal of the record reveals that accused was granted bail by the Ld. Sessions Court. A perusal of the reply would also reveal that the applicant/accused has concealed material facts in as much as that application for modification of bail orders on similar grounds were dismissed on 12.06.2020 by the Ld. ASJ. Moreover, the accused did not fulfill the conditions of bail namely deposit of passport.

Without going into the merits of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that it does not have the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the present complaint as the bail

orders were passed by the Ld. Sessions Court. Merely because the bonds had to be furnished before this Court, in the perception of this Court, that alone would not confer jurisdiction to this Court to entertain the present complaint. Since the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court have passed successive directions for relaxation of conditions of furnishing surety and has mandated that under trials be released upon furnishing of personal bonds, it is for the concerned Jail Authorities to comply with the same. The Jail Authorities are well within their rights to satisfy themselves about the veracity of bail orders passed by the Courts. In the present case also, it has been averred that Jail Superintendent has sought to peruse certified copies of bail orders passed qua the accused. Since this Court has not passed order on bail, no further action is required to be taken by this Court. The applicant/accused is at liberty to move appropriate forum for redressal of his grievances.

The application is therefore dismissed.

Copy of this order be uploaded on the District Courts website forthwith.  
Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary intimation to the accused via official email ID.

**(Arul Varma)**  
**CMM (Central), Delhi**  
**24.06.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, LD. CHIEF METROPOLITAIN  
MAGISTRATE, CENTRAL DISTRICT, TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**

**FIR No. 179/2017**

**PS: Economic Offence Wing (Central)**

**State Vs. Avdhesh Kumar Goel**

**U/s. 420/406/409/120-B IPC**

**Misc. Application**

**24.06.2020**

Present: Sh. Rajeev Kamboj, Ld. APP for the State has been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.  
Sh. Keshav Saini and Yash Varma, Ld. Counsels for applicant/accused have been joined via Video Conferencing through Cisco Webex.

Vide this order, I shall dispose off the application received through E-mail as moved on behalf of applicant/accused Avdhesh Kumar Goel for release of the accused on personal bonds, and for giving directions to the Jail Superintendent to accept uncertified copies of bail orders whereby the accused was enlarged of bail orders. Ld. Counsel for the accused has contended that the accused is languishing in Jail as the Superintendent of Tihar Jail has refused to accept personal bonds.

Reply to the said application has been received from the IO through E-mail.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the application as per law.

Submissions heard. Reply of IO perused.

A perusal of the record reveals that accused was granted bail by the Ld. Sessions Court. A perusal of the reply would also reveal that the applicant/accused has concealed material facts in as much as that application for modification of bail orders on similar grounds were dismissed on 12.06.2020 by the Ld. ASJ. Moreover, the accused did not fulfill the conditions of bail namely deposit of passport.

Without going into the merits of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that it does not have the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the present complaint as the bail

orders were passed by the Ld. Sessions Court. Merely because the bonds had to be furnished before this Court, in the perception of this Court, that alone would not confer jurisdiction to this Court to entertain the present complaint. Since the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court have passed successive directions for relaxation of conditions of furnishing surety and has mandated that under trials be released upon furnishing of personal bonds, it is for the concerned Jail Authorities to comply with the same. The Jail Authorities are well within their rights to satisfy themselves about the veracity of bail orders passed by the Courts. In the present case also, it has been averred that Jail Superintendent has sought to peruse certified copies of bail orders passed qua the accused. Since this Court has not passed order on bail, no further action is required to be taken by this Court. The applicant/accused is at liberty to move appropriate forum for redressal of his grievances.

The application is therefore dismissed.

Copy of this order be uploaded on the District Courts website forthwith.  
Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary intimation to the accused via official email ID.

**(Arul Varma)**  
**CMM (Central), Delhi**  
**24.06.2020**