State vs. Sumit Giri

16.07.2020

District courts functioning has been restricted till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi however, courts have been directed to take urgent matters.

Present: Ld. APP for the State. Accused produced from CJ-1 through VC. LAC in person. Complainant in person. Owner of stolen property through VC. IO through VC.

File perused.

It is submitted by the complainant and owner of stolen property that they do not want to pursue the case as they have received the stolen mobile. In view of the above, they seek permission of the Court to compound the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC.

Heard. File perused.

I have examined the complainant and owner of stolen property about their voluntariness and having examined them, I am satisfied that they are making statement voluntarily. Therefore, let their statements to this effect be recorded separately and be sent to them through whatsapp with direction to sign the same and send it back to the court through whatsapp. Statement sent and recived back duly signed.

File perused, perusal of the file reveals that accused is sent to face the trial for the offence punishable under section 411 IPC. Section 411 IPC is compoundable within the scheme of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 by the owner of the property stolen. Therefore, in view of statement of complainant and owner of stolen property, offence stands compounded. Consequently, accused *Sumit Giri* stands *acquitted* of the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC.

Superdari, if any stands canceled. Case property, if any, be released to the rightful owner after proper acknowledgement.

Original documents, if any be given to rightful owner after proper acknowledgement

Accused Sumit Giri be released from JC, if not required in any other case. Copy of order be sent to Jail Superintendent for compliance.

File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

(Babita Puniya) MM-06/West District Ti2920.07.16159hi

16.07.2020

District courts functioning has been restricted till 31,07,2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi however, courts have been directed to take urgent matters.

Present: Ld. APP for the State. Accused produced from CJ-1 through VC. LAC in person. Complainant and owner of stolen property through VC. IO through VC.

File perused.

It is submitted by the complainant and owner of stolen property that they do not want to pursue the case as they have received the stolen mobile. In view of the above, they seek permission of the Court to compound the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC.

Heard. File perused.

I have examined the complainant and owner of stolen property about their voluntariness and having examined them, I am satisfied that they are making statement voluntarily. Therefore, let their statements to this effect be recorded separately and be sent to them through whatsapp with direction to sign the same and send it back to the court through whatsapp. Statement sent and recived back duly signed.

File perused, perusal of the file reveals that accused is sent to face the trial for the offence punishable under section 411 IPC. Section 411 IPC is compoundable within the scheme of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 by the owner of the property stolen. Therefore, in view of statement of complainant and owner of stolen property, offence stands compounded. Consequently, accused *Sumit Giri* stands *acquitted* of the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC.

Superdari, if any stands canceled. Case property, if any, be released to the rightful owner after proper acknowledgement.

Original documents, if any be given to rightful owner after proper acknowledgement

Accused *Sumit Giri* be released from JC, if not required in any other case. Copy of order be sent to Jail Superintendent for compliance.

File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

(Babita Puniya) MM-06/West District T2020.07.16.16.53

State vs. Sumit Giri

16.07.2020

District courts functioning has been restricted till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi however, courts have been directed to take urgent matters.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Accused produced from CJ-1 through VC. LAC in person. Complainant/owner of stolen property through VC. IO through VC.

File perused.

It is submitted by the complainant/owner of stolen property that he does not want to pursue the case as he has received the stolen scooty. In view of the above, he seeks permission of the Court to compound the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC.

Heard. File perused.

I have examined the complainant/owner of stolen property about his voluntariness and having examined him, I am satisfied that he is making statement voluntarily. Therefore, let his statement to this effect be recorded separately and be sent to him through whatsapp with direction to sign the same and send it back to the court through whatsapp. Statement sent and recived back duly signed.

File perused, perusal of the file reveals that accused is sent to face the trial for the offence punishable under section 411 IPC. Section 411 IPC is compoundable within the scheme of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 by the owner of the property stolen. Therefore, in view of statement of complainant and owner of stolen property, offence stands compounded. Consequently, accused *Sumit Giri* stands *acquitted* of the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC.

Superdari, if any stands canceled. Case property, if any, be released to the rightful owner after proper acknowledgement.

Original documents, if any be given to rightful owner after proper acknowledgement

Accused *Sumit Giri* be released from JC, if not required in any other case. Copy of order be sent to Jail Superintendent for compliance.

File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

(Babita Puniya) MM-06/West District Tis H2026.07516-16:49 FIR No. 340/2020 PS Nangloi **State Vs Vinod & Ors.**

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Reply filed.

As per reply, on 10.07.2020, chargesheet has already been filed. In view of the same, Id. Counsel for the complainant wishes to withdraw the

ith drawn

FIR No. 141/2020, 1525/2020, 232/2020 PS Paschim Vihar West U/s 379/411 State Vs. Sombir 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for applicant.

IO is absent.

IO has not filed report.

Put up for arguments on the application through VC or 20.07.2020 a 1 PM. IO to also join the proceeding and file the report vide order dated 14.07.2020. Notice to counsel for applicant be also issued.

(Babita Puniya) Duty MM-I/West/Delhi 16.07.2020

FIR No. 141/2020, 1525/2020, 232/2020 PS Paschim Vihar West U/s 379/411 State Vs. Sombir 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State. None for applicant. IO is absent. IO has not filed report. Put up for arguments on the arguit FIR No. 141/2020, 1525/2020, 232/2020 PS Paschim Vihar West U/s 379/411 State Vs. Sombir 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. *R-235/RG/DHC* dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State. None for applicant. IO is absent. IO has not filed report. Put_up_for_arguments_on_the FIR No. 003449/2020, 001525/2019 PS Paschim Vihar West U/s 379/411 IPC State Vs. Sombir

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Krishan, proxy Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused **Sombir**.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 05.03.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail on furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount in the above-mentioned FIR's only.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for the applicant wishes to file separate bail applications for remaining FIR's.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Babita Runiya) Duty MM-I/West/Delhi 16.07.220.07.16 15:16 FIR No. 665/2020 PS Khyala **U/s 33 Delhi Excise Act.** State Vs. Kailash 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for applicant.

Reply not filed by the IO/SHO concerned.

SHO concerned is directed to join the proceedings tomorrow at 12.30 PM through VC.

FIR No. 131/2020 PS Paschim Vihar West U/s 25 Arms Act. State Vs. Sunil @ Rahul 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

None for applicant.

Reply not filed by the Jail Superintendent concerned.

He is directed to join the proceedings tomorrow at 12.30 PM through VC.

E-FIR No. 0358/2020 **PS** Paschim Vihar U/s 411 IPC

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused Vishal.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 07.07.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected and in view of the conditions prevailing due to COVID-19 pandemic, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail on furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Babita Puniya) Duty MM-I/West/Delhi 2020.07.16 14:49

PS MUNDKA U/s 33 Delhi Excise Act.

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Ld. APP for the State. Present :

Applicant in person.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of mobile phone make Vivo S-1 on Superdari.

Reply filed and perused. As per reply, IO has no objection, if the said mobile is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Applications perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. mobile Vivo S-1 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let mobile be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the same; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of mobile should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.

However, the rightful owner/registered owner is directed not to dispose of the mobile without prior permission of the court.

The applications stand disposed of accordingly. Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

> (Babita Puniya) Duty MM-1/West/Delhi 07.16 14:49 16.07

PS Ranjit Nagar U/s 379/411/356/34 IPC

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. V.S. Tiwari, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no. DL1R Q 5938** on Superdari.

Reply filed and perused. As per reply, IO has no objection, if the vehicle is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Applications perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no. DL1R Q 5938 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the vehicle should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in **Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State**.

However, the rightful owner/registered owner is directed not to dispose of the vehicle without prior permission of the court.

The applications stand disposed of accordingly. Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

> (Babita Puniya) Duty MM-I/West/Delhi 12020.07.16 14:48

U/s 379/411/356/34 IPC

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. V.S. Tiwari, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused **Abrar**.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 18.06.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail on furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Babita Puniya) Duty MM-I/West/Delhi 16.07.2020 2020.07.16 14:48 FIR No. 013547/2020 PS Rajauri Garden U/s 379 IPC 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. S.P. Shukla, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no. DL10 SA 4159** on Superdari.

Reply filed and perused. As per reply, IO has no objection, if the vehicle is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Applications perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no. DL10 SA 4159 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the vehicle should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in **Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State**.

However, the rightful owner/registered owner is directed not to dispose of the vehicle without prior permission of the court.

The applications stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

PS Khyala U/s 33/38/58 Delhi Excise Act.

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Ld. counsel for accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused **Kailash @ Mahesh**.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 07.07.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail on furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Babita Puniya) Duty NROROZIE 12:52

PS Nangloi U/s 392/411/34 IPC

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Joginder Singh, ld. counsel for the accused.

IO in person.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused Laxman @ Poli.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 27.05.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail or furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of like amount.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Babita Puniva) Duty 2020.07.16 12:47 FIR No. 178/2020 PS Rajauri Garden U/s 379/411/34 IPC 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Applicant with Ld. Counsel Sh. Vijay Kumar.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no. DL1R P 2700** on Superdarí.

Reply filed and perused. As per reply, IO has no objection, if the vehicle is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Applications perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no. DL1R P 2700 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the vehicle should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in **Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.**

However, the rightful owner/registered owner is directed not to dispose of the vehicle without prior permission of the court.

The applications stand disposed of accordingly. Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

> (Babita Puniya) Duty MM-I/West/Delhi 16.07.2020 2020.07.16 11:50

PS **Rajauri Garden** U/s **25 Arms Act**.

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Pranay Abhishek, Id. counsel for the accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused **Jitender**.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 14.07.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the insidered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the cused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail o hishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of lik ount subject to condition that he will not try to influence the witness.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Babita Puniya) Duty MM-I/West/Delbi 12020.07.16 11:58

FIR No. 411/2020 PS Mayapuri U/s 33/38/58 Delhi Excise Act

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Proxy counsel for the accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused Ajit.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 10.07.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail pplication. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the ccused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the nsidered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the cused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail on hishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- with one surety of like ount.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

FIR No. 688/2020 PS Nangloi U/s 25/54/59 Arms Act.

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Sh. Mahender Pal, counsel for the accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused **Deepak** @ **Deepu**.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 27.05.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail on urnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- with one surety of like mount.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Babita Puniya) Duty M2620.65.1612:13 FIR No. 011025/20 PS Nihal Vihar U/s 379/411/34 IPC 16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Sh. Neeraj Sagar, Id. counsel for the applicant.

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking release of **vehicle bearing no. DL9S BM 4497** on Superdari.

Reply filed and perused. As per reply, IO has no objection, if the vehicle is released to the registered owner/rightful owner.

Heard. Applications perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs and having taken note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai V. State of Gujarat (A.I.R.2003 S.C.638) and Manjeet Singh Vs. State, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the case property i.e. vehicle bearing no. DL9S BM 4497 can be released to the applicant/registered owner/rightful owner, subject to execution of security bonds. Accordingly, let vehicle be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle; valuation report; a security bond etc.

The photographs of the vehicle should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

The panchnama/photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with the charge-sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in **Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujarat & Manjeet Singh Vs. State.**

However, the rightful owner/registered owner is directed not to dispose of the vehicle without prior permission of the court.

The applications stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

(Babita Puniya) Duty MM-I/West/Delhi 16.072020.07.16 11:50 FIR No. 014389/2020 PS Nangloi U/s 379 IPC

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Sh. Biswajeet Kumar, Id. counsel for the accused.

Reply filed by the IO perused.

This is an application u/s 437 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of bail moved on behalf of accused **Satish**.

It is submitted on behalf of accused that he is in custody since 29.06.2020 and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that recovery has already been effected and accused is no more required for further custodial investigation.

Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application. He stated that investigation is at nascent stage and if the accused is released from JC he will indulge in similar type of activity.

Heard. File perused.

Since, recovery has already been effected, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind the bars, therefore, accused is admitted to bail on furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount.

Duty M

16 11:50

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

FIR No. 521/20 PS Miyanwali Nagar U/s 392/411/34 IPC

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended till 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, however, courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no. R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

None for applicant/accused.

No report received from Jail Superintendent concerned.

Let the same be called for 17.07.2020.

FIR No. 213/19 PS Khyala U/s 308/341/506 IPC &25/27/54 Arms Act.

16.07.2020

District Courts functioning has been restricted/suspended ti 31.07.2020 amid lock-down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, howeve courts have been directed to take up the urgent matters vide office order no R-235/RG/DHC dated 16.05.2020.

Present : Ld. APP for the State through VC. None for applicant/accused. No report received from Jail Superintendent concerned. Let the same be called for 17.07.2020.