State Vs. Kiran Kalia

P.S.: Vikas Puri FIR No : 254/13

U/s: 376D/120B/109/34 IPC

26.08.2020.

Present:

Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh. Lokesh Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the accused.

Mr. Kashish Kalia surety of accused Kiran Kalia in person.

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

Accused Kiran Kalia was convicted and sentenced to the period already undergone. The surety were discharged.

Original documents i.e. original Aadhar Card and 3 NSCs bearing no. OODE 277347, 47EF 652261 and 47EF 652262 be released against proper receipt. The Post Master, Post office Tis Hazari is directed to release the amount in favour of the rightful owner.

Application is disposed off accordingly. Copy of the order be given dasti.

File be consigned to Record Room.

(Ankur Jain)

ASJ (SFTC-01) West

Bail Application No.: 1826 Ishika Grover Vs. State FIR No. : 503/20

PS

: Hari Nagar

U/s

: 323/342/452/34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

26.08.2020

Fresh bail application filed. It be checked and registered. It is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no. 322/ RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No.524/12979-13069/ Misc./Gaz./DJ/West/2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Jitender Kumar Dhama, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused.

Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submits that he has received instructions from his client to withdraw the bail applications. Let an email be sent in this regard.

Be awaited.

(ANKUR JAIN) ASJ(Special Rast Track Court)-01

West, THC, Delhi/26.08.2020

26.08.2020 at 12:05 PM

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Jitender Kumar Dhama, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused.

Mail has been received. A print out of email be placed on record. In view of the same present bail application is dismissed as withdrawn. File be consigned to record room.

> ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01 C, Delhi/26.08.2020 West, Th

Bail Application No.: 1827 Neeru Grover Vs. State FIR No.: 503/20

PS : Hari Nagar

U/s : 323/342/452/34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

26.08.2020

Fresh bail application filed. It be checked and registered. It is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no. 322/ RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No.524/12979-13069/ Misc./Gaz./DJ/West/2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Present: Mr. Subhas

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Jitender Kumar Dhama, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused.

Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submits that he has received instructions from his client to withdraw the bail applications. Let an email be sent in this regard.

Be awaited.

(ANKUR JAIN)

ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01 West, THC, Delhi/26.08.2020

26.08.2020 at 12:05 PM

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Jitender Kumar Dhama, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused.

Mail has been received. A print out of email be placed on record. In view of the same present bail application is dismissed as withdrawn. File be consigned to record room.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THS, Delhi/26.08.2020

Bail Application No. : 1777 Naresh Kumar Vs. State

FIR No.

: 410/20

PS

: Maya Puri

U/s

: 308 IPC

26.08.2020

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Nepal Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

SI Vipin Malik in person.

First bail application was dismissed on 10.08.2020. After hearing arguments Ld. Counsel for accused request for adjournment.

At request, put up on 28.08.2020.

(ANKUR JAIN)

Bail Application No.: 1447

State Vs. Ganesh P.S.: Kirti Nagar

FIR No: 59/20

U/s.: 308/323/506/304/34 IPC

26.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW. Sh. Vineet Jain, Ld. Counsel for the accused

Put up for further proceedings on 28.08.2020.

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

10 Inspector Surya Prakash in person.

Ld. counsel for the accused submits that for surgery of Naina, he had approached the RLKC hospital and Metro Heart Institute. Photocopy of the documents have been filed. Copy of the same is handed over to the IO to verify the same

(Ankur Jain)

ASJ (SF/C-01) West

Bail Application No.: 1673

State Vs. Manuwar Hussain @ Mikki

P.S.: Kirti Nagar

FIR No: 59/20

U/s: 308/304/323/506/34 IPC

26.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh. Ayub Ahmed Qureshi, Ld. Counsel for the accused

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

10 Inspector Surya Prakash in person.

Ld. counsel for the accused submits that copy of the report filed by the IO has not been supplied. Same is supplied today.

Put up on <u>28.08.2020</u>, the date on which the bail application of coaccused is coming up.

TCR be sent back and be again requisitioned for the date fixed.

(Ankur Jain)

ASJ (SFTC-01) West

State Vs. SUNNY P.S.: Anand Parbat

FIR No : 123/2020

U/s.: 452/341/354 (B)/323/506/509/34 IPC R/w Section 10/12 of POCSO Act

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

26.08.2020.

|Fresh bail application filed. It be checked and registered and is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 289-321/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 524/12979-13069/Misc./Gaz./DJ/West2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh. Deepak Maharaj, Ld. Counsel for the accused

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

Let notice of the application be issued to the IO for filing reply.

Notice be also issued upon the complainant through IO in terms of the practice directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Put up for further proceedings on 31.08.2020.

(Ankur Jain)
DutyJudge/ASJ (SFTC-01) West

Bail Application No. : 1825 Sumit Bhasin Vs. State

FIR No.

: 71/20

PS

: Maya Puri

U/s

: 498A/ 406/ 34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

26.08.2020

Fresh bail application filed. It be checked and registered. It is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no. 322/ RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No.524/12979-13069/ Misc./Gaz./DJ/West/2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. M. K. Gahlaut, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused.

Reply on behalf of IO filed. Copy of the reply be sent to the Counsel for the accused.

I also deem it appropriate that notice should be issued to the complainant before deciding the present bail application.

Let notice be issued to complainant through IO for 29.08.2020.

(ANKUR JAIN)

FIR No: 628/15

PS: Khyala

STATE VS. Mohd. Junaid

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

26.08.2020

File is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No.524/12979-13069/ Misc./Gaz./DJWest/2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Present:

Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl.PP for State.

Ms. Arti Pandey, DCW counsel

None for accused.

Adverse order is deferred.

Put up for appearance of accused on 13.10.2020.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01

West, THC, Delhi/26.08.2020

State Vs. Vipul Jokhani

P.S.: Hari Nagar

FIR No: 481/20

U/s.: 420 IPC & 66 A & 66 D IT Act

26.08.2020.

Application is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 289-321/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 524/12979-13069/Misc./Gaz./DJ/West2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Present:

Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh. Amit Saini and Pulkit Dandona, Ld. Counsels for the accused

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

SI Amit Verma on behalf of the IO PS Hari Nagar.

Reply on behalf of Inspector Arun Kumar has been filed stating that accused has joined the investigation as directed.

Put up for arguments on <u>05.10.2020</u>. Accused shall join the investigation as and when called for by the IO. Till then interim order to continue.

(Ankur Jain) ASJ (SFTC-01) West Delhi: 26.08.2020 FIR No : 276/2018 PS: Anand Parbat STATE VS. Virender Kumar Mathuria

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

26.08.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl.PP for State.

Ms. Arti Pandey, DCW counsel

Mr. S. C. Paul, Ld. Counsel for accused with all the

accused.

Arguments on behalf of accused heard through VC.

Put up for arguments on behalf of State on 28.08.2020.

(ANKUR JAIN)

FIR No: 833/19 PS: Nihal Vihar STATE VS. Krishan Kumar

26.08.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl.PP for State.

Ms. Arti Pandey, DCW counsel Accused not produced from JC.

Mr. Surender Nandal, Ld. Counsel for accused.

Production warrants be issued against accused for 29.08.2020.

(ANKUR JAIN)

Bail Application No. : 1755

'S' Vs. State

FIR No. : 386/2020

PS : Mundka

U/s : 307/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

26.08.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Ankit Rai, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Report on behalf of IO filed. As per report of IO the accused 'S' (name withheld) was juvenile at the time of his arrest. It is further submitted that accused is being transferred to OHB. Ld. Counsel for accused submits that present bail application be transferred to concerned JJB.

Copy of the report filed by IO be sent through Whats app to Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused.

The application be send to Ld. CMM (West) for appropriate orders for tomorrow i.e. 27.08.2020. Ld. Counsel for accused submits that application should be taken up through Cisco WebEx.

(ANKUR JAIN)

State Vs. Lalit Kumar

P.S.: Mundka FIR No : 391/20

U/s: 323/376/328/313/506 IPC

26.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh. Mukesh Birla, Ld. Counsel for the accused

Sh. Naveen Gulia, Ld. Counsel for the complainant along with

complainant.

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

SI Lalita in person.

Fresh Vakalatnama on behalf of the counsel for the complainant filed. Same is taken on record.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(Ankur Jain) ASJ (SFTC-01) West

Delhi: 26.08.2020

ORDER:-

The brief facts of the case of that one "MD" had given a written complaint against the accused in which she alleged that she came in contact with the accused as he had taken a shop on rent, in their house. It was further stated that once when nobody was present in the home accused forcibly raped her, thereafter accused repeatedly established physical relations with her on the pretext of false marriage. It is further alleged that accused had prepared obscene video and taken photographs and after

showing the same to the prosecutrix he used to make physical relations with her.

It is argued by the Ld. Counsel for the accused that there is no specific date which could show as to when the accused forcible raped her. It is submitted that accused used to give money to the complainant and once that was stopped the present FIR was lodged. It is argued that accused is a Govt. servant and would not run away.

On the other hand Ld. Addl. PP for the State has argued that allegations are serious in nature. Investigation is at initial stage, the complainant has supported the case in the statement made u/s 164 Cr.P.C, therefore, the bail application of the accused deserves to be dismissed. It is also argued that when on 17.08.2020 accused was called for investigation he did not co-operate.

Ld. counsel for the complainant has argued that accused is repeatedly threatened the complainant and is also sending the obscene videos to complainant in order to pressurize her to withdraw the complainant. He submits that the video can be seen by this court.

In rebuttal Ld. Counsel for accused has stated that he is carrying the phone of the accused and the same can be seized by the IO today itself. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the accused, complainant and Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

The allegations against the accused are serious in nature. The accused is working in CISF and there is every likelihood that he can influence the witnesses. As per the report of the IO on 17.08.2020 accused has joined the investigation but had not co-operated as he did not provide the mobile phone. The submissions of the counsel for the accused that the said mobile can be seized today is of no help as this shows that accused has stopped using the said instrument and tempering cannot be ruled out. I do not find any

ground to grant anticipatory bail to the accused. Application of the accused stands dismissed.

Copy of the order be given dasti.

(Ankur Jain) ASJ (SFTC-01) West

SC No. 19/20

State Vs. Avinash P.S.: Punjabi Bagh FIR No: 507/19 U/s: 376 IPC

26.08.2020.

File is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 289-321/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 524/12979-13069/Misc./Gaz./DJ/West2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State. Present:

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh.Arun Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the accused (through VC).

Accused present in court. HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

Ld. counsel for the accused has fairly conceded that charge be framed. Even otherwise from the perusal of the complaint, statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C of the victim it is clear that prima-facie there is sufficient material to frame charge against the accused. In Catena of judgments it has been held by Hon'ble Delhi High Court that reasoned order is not required to be passed at the time of framing of charge.

Formal Charge u/s 452/376 (2) (n)/313/377 IPC framed to which accused pleads not guilty and claim trial.

Put up for PE on 01.02.2021. Prosecutrix be summoned for the said date.

> (Ankur Jain) ASJ (SFTC 01) West

IN THE COURT OF SH ANKUR JAIN, SPECIAL JUDGE (Spl. Fast Track Court)-01, WEST DISTRICT, THC, DELHI

FIR No: 507/19 PS: Punjabi Bagh STATE VS. Avinash

Charge

I, Ankur Jain, Special Judge, Fast Track Court-01, West District, Delhi do hereby charge you **Avinash S/o Shri Jyoti Prasad** as follows:-

That four years prior to 13.09.2019, one day, you committed house tress pass by entering into the room of the prosecutrix (name and address of prosecutrix mentioned in the record but withheld in order to conceal her identity, however, the name and address of the prosecutrix have been told to the accused verbally), repeatedly committed rape thereafter, upon her and thereby you committed an offence punishable under Section 452/376 (2) (n) IPC and within the cognizance of this Court.

Secondly, after the prosecutrix became pregnant, you gave beatings to her at the room of prosecutrix and due to which miscarriage has taken place and on another occasion when prosecutrix again became pregnant, you brought food for her at the room of the prosecutrix and after eating the food, miscarriage had again taken place and thereby you committed an offence u/s 313 IPC and within the cognizance of this court.

Thirdly, three months prior to 13.09.2019, at the room of prosecturix you committed carnal intercourse against the order of

Amist.

4

nature with prosecutrix and thereby you committed an offence punishable U/s 377 IPC.

And I hereby direct that you be tried by this court for the above said offenses.

Addl. Sessions Judge Spl. (F.T.C)-01, West District, THC/26.08.2020

Charge has been read over and explained to accused persons who is questioned as under:

Q. Have you understood the charge?

Ans. Yes.

Q. Do you plead guilty or claim trial?

Ans. I plead not guilty and claim trial.

RO & AC

Addl. Sessions Judge Spl. (F.T.C)-01, West District, THC/26.08.2020

SC No. 33/17

State Vs. Pramod Kumar & Anr.

P.S.: Maya Puri FIR No: 560/15

U/s: 363/376/506 IPC

26.08.2020.

File is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 289-321/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 524/12979-13069/Misc./Gaz./DJ/West2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh. Amandeep Thakur, Ld. Counsel for the accused Pramod (through VC).

Sh. R.P. Singh, Ld. Counsel for accused Ashok along with accused Ashok.

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

Ld. counsel for accused Pramod submits that accused Pramod could not join the proceedings through CISCO Web-Ex and he requests for exemption.

At his oral request, accused stands exempted.

Matter is listed for PE. No PW is present today. Evidence cannot be recorded in terms of the above said circular.

Put up for PE on <u>02.02.2021</u>. PWs be summoned for the said date. Let prosecutrix be summoned through IO/SHO for <u>02.02.2021</u>.

> (Ankur Jain) ASJ (SFTC 01) West Delhi: 26.08.2020

Bail Application No.: 1713

Ajay Kumar Vs. State FIR No. : 810/2020

PS : Nihal Vihar

U/s : 376 IPC

26.08.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.

Mr. Surender Nandal, Ld. Counsel for applicant/

accused. IO in person.

Complainant in person.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/26.08.2020

26.08.2020 at 1 PM

1. The brief facts of the case are that on the complaint of Ms. 'SK' present FIR was registered. In her complaint it is alleged that she along with accused used to work in house keeping department of Satya Bhama Hospital where they became

good friends. They decided to marry each other and met their family members. A few days after the death of complainant's father accused has called her to his house and asked her to establish physical relations. Complainant refused but he assured that he would marry her. On the false pretext of marriage accused established physical relations. Thereafter, he also took her to Vaishno Devi. It is further stated that several times accused established physical relations with the complainant. It is further stated that whenever complainant used to ask for marriage he used to make an excuse. In January, 2020 accused told her that he is not in a position to marry her. The aunty of complainant intervened and spoke to the family members of the accused, thereafter everything went all right. However, in May, 2020 accused left for his native place and complainant came to know that accused has got married.

- 2. Ld. Counsel for the accused has argued that no offence U/s 376 IPC is made out as the act were consensual. It is argued that on the reading of the FIR it is clear that victim is of matured age and every act was with her consent. In support of his argument he has relied upon the order of Hon'ble High Court in bail application no. 1580/19, Shiv Kumar Kushwaha Vs. State of NCT Delhi decided on 26.02.2020.
- 3. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has argued that



allegations are serious in nature. The FIR clearly records that physical relations were established on the first time on the false pretext of marriage.

- 4. I have heard the Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused and Ld. Addl. PP for State and perused the record.
- 5. The FIR clearly records that victim had refused to establish physical relations with the accused but on the assurance given by the accused that since they are engaged there is no harm in establishing physical relations as they would soon marry. Thus, the victim entered into physical relationship only on the false pretext of marriage. The order of the Hon'ble High Court is distinguishable on the facts of the present case as in the said case only a false promise of marriage was made whereas in the present case it is specifically stated that victim has refused to establish physical relations but on the reassurance of the accused to marry she agreed. Thus, I do not find any ground to grant anticipatory bail to the accused. Bail application is accordingly dismissed. Copy of the order be given dasti.

State Vs. Netrapal P.S.: Nihal Vihar FIR No: 680/20 U/s.: 376 IPC

26.08.2020.

Present:

Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh. Vikas Rohtagi, Ld. Counsel for the accused Netrapal.

Sh. Deepak Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the complainant along with complainant.

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

Charge-sheet received. This is the 3rd bail application filed on behalf of the accused. The first bail application was dismissed on 09.07.2020 via speaking order. Second bail application was dismissed as withdrawn on 27.07.2020.

Ld. counsel for the accused submits that since charge-sheet has been filed it tantamount to "change in circumstances". Ld. Counsel for the accused seeks time to place on record the authorities in this respect.

At the request of Ld. Counsel for the accused, present application be taken up on 01.09.2020 through physical hearing.

Charge-sheet be sent back to the concerned court and be requisitioned again for the said date.

(Ankur Jain) ASJ (SFTC-01) West Delhi: 26.08.2020

SC No. 117/16 State Vs. Tanuj Kandpal & Ors.

P.S.: Paschim Vihar

FIR No: 32/2015

U/s: 376/323/506/354-A IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

26.08.2020.

File is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 289-321/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and No. 524/12979-13069/Misc./Gaz./DJ/West2020 dated 16.08.2020.

Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State. Present:

Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Sh.Abhishek Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the accused Tanuj Kandpal

and C.S. Kandpal

HC Ankit Dahiya Naib Court.

Ld. Counsel for the accused Tanuj and C.S. Kandpal submits that accused persons could not join the proceedings. He requests for their exemption.

At the oral request of Ld. Counsel accused Tarun and C.S. Kandpal stands exempted.

Production warrants not received back.

Let fresh production warrants be issued against the accused Rohit Pratap Singh for **22.09.2020**.

> (Ankur Jain) ASJ (SFTC-01) West Delhi: 26.08.2020