

FIR No. 220/20  
PS: Ranjeet Nagar  
U/s 379/411 of IPC  
06.08.2020

**State**  
**Vs.**  
**Prakash @ Ashu**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. Satish Kumar, Ld. LAC for the  
applicant/accused Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.

Argument heard on the bail application on behalf of the  
accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the  
present case.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the applicant/accused has already suffered incarceration  
for about more than 3 months and factum of filing the charge-sheet  
is not specified in reply to the bail application. Accordingly, the  
accused Prakash @ Anshu is hereby released on bail on his  
furnishing the personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- and one  
surety of the like amount.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to Ld. LAC for the accused,  
as prayed for.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

FIR No. 294/20  
PS: Ranhola  
U/s 379/356/411/34 of IPC  
06.08.2020

**State**  
**Vs.**  
**Ajay Kumar**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. Anil Kr. Sharma, Ld. counsel for the applicant/accused  
Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.


Argument heard on the interim bail application on behalf of the accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the applicant/accused is in JC for more than 4 months months days. It is further submitted that the application has been scrutinized by the High Power Committee constituted as per the minute dated 18.05.2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC particularly in view of outbreak of COVID-19. Accordingly, the accused Ajay Kumar be hereby released on interim bail for 45 days, if he is not required to be kept in JC in any other criminal case, on his furnishing the personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- to the satisfaction of Jail Superintendent concerned. Jail Superintendent shall also ascertain from PS concerned as to whether the address of the accused is verified or not before releasing the accused.

Full signed duplicate of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned, which shall also be treated as release warrant upon the acceptance of personal bond.

Copy of this order be given Dasti, as prayed for.

  
(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

**State**

**Vs.**

**Devinder Singh @ Prince**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. M.L. Gupta, Ld. counsel for the  
applicant/accused Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.

Argument heard on the bail application on behalf of the  
accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the  
present case.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected, no useful  
purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC. Accordingly,  
the accused Devinder Singh @ Prince is hereby released on bail on  
his furnishing the personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- and one  
surety of the like amount.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

**State**  
**Vs.**  
**Ajay Kumar**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. Anil Kr. Sharma, Ld. counsel for the applicant/accused  
Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.


Argument heard on the interim bail application on behalf of the accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the applicant/accused is in JC for more than 4 months months days. It is further submitted that the application has been scrutinized by the High Power Committee constituted as per the minute dated 18.05.2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC particularly in view of outbreak of COVID-19. Accordingly, the accused Ajay Kumar be hereby released on interim bail for 45 days, if he is not required to be kept in JC in any other criminal case, on his furnishing the personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- to the satisfaction of Jail Superintendent concerned. Jail Superintendent shall also ascertain from PS concerned as to whether the address of the accused is verified or not before releasing the accused.

Full signed duplicate of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned, which shall also be treated as release warrant upon the acceptance of personal bond.

Copy of this order be given Dasti, as prayed for.

  
(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

E-FIR No. 10465/20  
PS: Tilak Naghar  
U/s 379/411 IPC  
06.08.2020

**State**  
**Vs.**  
**Ranjeet Singh**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. Suresh Bhardwaj, Ld. counsel for the  
applicant/accused Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.

Argument heard on the bail application on behalf of the  
accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the  
present case.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected, no useful  
purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC. Accordingly,  
the accused Ranjeet Singh is hereby released on bail on his  
furnishing the personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- and one  
surety of the like amount.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to Ld. counsel for the  
accused, as prayed for.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

FIR No. 280/20  
PS: Ranjit Nagar  
U/s 25/54/59 Arms Act  
06.08.2020

0/20  
agar  
Act  
020

**State**

**Vs.**

**Karan**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. Ravi Shukla, Ld. counsel for the  
applicant/accused Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.

Argument heard on the bail application on behalf of the  
accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the  
present case.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected, no useful  
purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC. Accordingly,  
the accused Karan is hereby released on bail on his furnishing the  
personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- and one surety of the like  
amount.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to Ld. counsel for the  
accused, as prayed for.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

FIR No. 110/20  
PS: Tilak Nagar  
U/s 356/379/34 of IPC  
06.08.2020

**State**  
**Vs.**  
**Abhishek**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. Brahmanand Gupta, Ld. counsel for the applicant/accused  
Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.

Argument heard on the bail application on behalf of the accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that there is no eye-witness at the spot. It is further submitted that the applicant/accused has already suffered incarceration for about 47 day. The investigation in the present case is going on.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State for the reason that TIP of the applicant/accused is yet to be conducted. There is an allegation against applicant/accused that he was found in possession of stolen gold ring and bag etc. belonging to the complainant. TIP Proceeding of the applicant/accused is yet to be conducted. Motorcycle used in the commission of theft was found to be belonging to the father of the applicant/accused. As per the allegation, there was two boys, who were sitting in the alleged motorcycle. The investigation in the present case is still going on. The allegations are serious in nature. No ground is made out for grant of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the present bail application is hereby dismissed.

Copy of this Order be given Dasti to Ld. counsel for the applicant/accused as prayed.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

**State**  
**Vs.**  
**Parveen**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. Tarun Sharma, Ld. counsel for the  
applicant/accused Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.

Argument heard on the bail application on behalf of the  
accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the  
present case. It is further submitted that there is no eye-witness at  
the sport.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

There is an allegation against the accused of having been  
found in possession of 894 quarter bottles of illicit liquor in Hyundai  
Accent Car bearing registration no. DL-4CS-5226. The owner of  
the said car is yet to be ascertained and arrested. No ground is  
made out for grant of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the present bail  
application is hereby dismissed.

Copy of this Order be sent to Ld. counsel for the  
applicant/accused through Whatsapp.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020



E-FIR No. 400/20  
PS: Moti Nagar  
U/s 379/411 IPC  
06.08.2020

**State**  
**Vs.**  
**Md. Maksood**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through Cisco Webex meeting  
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.  
Sh. M.L. Gupta, Ld. counsel for the  
applicant/accused Cisco Webex meeting URL  
<https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>.

Argument heard on the bail application on behalf of the  
accused. It is stated that the accused was falsely implicated in the  
present case.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected, no useful  
purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC. Accordingly,  
the accused Md. Maksood is hereby released on bail on his  
furnishing the personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- and one  
surety of the like amount.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to Ld. counsel for the  
accused, as prayed for.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

***This is an application for releasing vehicle bearing no. DL-6CP-6771 on Superdari.***

Present:- Ld. APP for the State.

Ld. counsel for the applicant.

IO has filed his reply. Taken on record.

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** wherein it has been held that

*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.*

*69. 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.*

*70. 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.*

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

*72. 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.*

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

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.**

Considering the facts and circumstances and law laid down by higher courts, vehicle in question bearing registration no. **DL-6CP-6771** be released to the **registered owner after due identity verification** and 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.

Copy of this order be given dasti to applicant.

Panchnama and valuation report shall be filed in the court along with charge sheet.

***This is an application for releasing vehicle bearing no. DL-4SBP-2058 on Superdari.***

Present:- Ld. APP for the State.  
Ld. counsel for the applicant.  
IO has filed his reply. Taken on record.

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** wherein it has been held that

*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.*

*69. 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.*

*70. 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.*

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

*72. 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.*

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

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.**

Considering the facts and circumstances and law laid down by higher courts, vehicle in question bearing registration no. **DL-4SBP-2058** be released to the **registered owner after due identity verification** and 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.

Copy of this order be given dasti to applicant.

Panchnama and valuation report shall be filed in the court along with charge sheet.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020

***This is an application for releasing vehicle bearing no. DL-10ER-2988 on Superdari.***

Present:- Ld. APP for the State.  
Ld. counsel for the applicant.  
IO has filed his reply. Taken on record.

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** wherein it has been held that

*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.*

*69. 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.*

*70. 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.*

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

*72. 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.*

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

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 CrI. M.C. No. 4485/2013 dated 10.09.2014.**

Considering the facts and circumstances and law laid down by higher courts, vehicle in question bearing registration no. **DL-10ER-2988** be released to the **registered owner after due identity verification** and 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.

Copy of this order be given dasti to applicant.

Panchnama and valuation report shall be filed in the court along with charge sheet.

(Pankaj Arora)  
DMM/West/THC/Delhi  
06.08.2020