

**State Vs. Bhawna Chug**

**FIR No: 35/20**

**Under Section: 498-A/406/34 IPC**

**PS: Subzi Mandi**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

Matter is taken up today on request of Ahlmad of this court.

Present: None.

It has been brought to my notice that due to typographical error, in the order dated 10.08.2020, 'PS Wazirabad' has been mentioned instead of 'PS Subzi Mandi' at the top of page no. 1.

Therefore, the order dated 10.08.2020 stands modified/clarified to the extent that the matter pertains to PS Subzi Mandi and not to PS Wazirabad. Therefore, the word 'PS Wazirabad' as appearing on the top of page no. 1 in said order shall be read as 'PS Subzi Mandi'.

Present order be digitally signed. Copy of this order be sent to Ld. Magistrate/SHO/IO as well as Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

Concerned Stenographer is warned to be careful in future.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:40:27  
+05'30'

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Raj Kumar Chug**

**FIR No: 35/20**

**Under Section: 498-A/406/34 IPC**

**PS: Subzi Mandi**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Matter is taken up today on request of Ahlmad of this court.**

Present: None.

It has been brought to my notice that due to typographical error, in the order dated 10.08.2020, 'FIR No. 25/20' has been mentioned instead of 'FIR No. 35/20' (at the bottom of page no. 1), 'FIR No. 120/20' has been mentioned instead of 'FIR No. 35/20' (at the bottom of page no. 2). It is further noted that the case title 'State Vs. Basant Tewatia' has been mentioned instead of 'State Vs. Raj Kumar Chug' (at the bottom of page no. 2) in the said order.

Therefore, the order dated 10.08.2020 stands modified/clarified to the extent that FIR number in the instant case is '35/20' and not '120/20' or '25/20'. It is further clarified that title of the case is 'State Vs. Raj Kumar Chug' and not 'State Vs. Basant Tewatia'. Therefore, the FIR No. 120/20 and FIR No. 25/20 shall be read as 'FIR No. 35/20' and case title 'State Vs. Basant Tewatia' shall be read as 'State Vs. Raj Kumar Chug' in order dated 10.08.2020.

Present order be digitally signed. Copy of this order be sent to Ld. Magistrate/SHO/IO as well as Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

Concerned Stenographer is warned to be careful in future.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:43:43 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Vikram Singh**

**PS: Subzi Mandi**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Khushwant Wadhwa, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Report filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

As per report of IO, neither any FIR is pending for investigation against applicant nor any complaint with CAW Cell is pending against the applicant. Therefore, it is evident that there is no apprehension, much less reasonable apprehension of accused being arrested in non-bailable offence.

**Therefore, the application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed as being non-maintainable.**

During course of arguments, Ld. Defence Counsel vehemently argued that applicant is being harassed by police officials and he was also assaulted by them. Needless to say, the applicant may pursue his remedy as per law against the said grievance.

Copy of the order be sent to Ld. Defence counsel through official email.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:47:14 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Tanish**

**FIR No: 318/20**

**U/s 376 IPC**

**PS: Civil Lines**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is fresh application for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Parkash Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Reply filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

As per applicant, he is Child in Conflict with Law (CCL) and his date of birth is 15.08.2002. However, the report filed by IO is silent about the claim of juvenility of the applicant. In these circumstances, let report be filed by the concerned SHO/IO regarding the said averments/claim.

Put up for arguments on 20.08.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:46:55 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Sharwan Kumar**

**FIR No: 224/2018**

**U/s 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 34 IPC**

**PS: Subzi Mandi**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is fresh application for grant of bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. S.K. Sinha, Ld. Counsel for applicant.  
Investigating Officer SI Dhan Singh through VC.

Reply filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

After arguing for some time, Ld. Counsel seeks liberty to withdraw the present application. **Accordingly the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.**

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:46:36 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Saraswati Devi**

**FIR No: Not known**

**PS: Timarpur**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is fresh application for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Manish Ahmad, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Reply filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

As per reply of IO, neither any FIR against applicant is pending in the concerned police station nor any police official from concerned police station is visiting the house of applicant to arrest her. Therefore, it is evident that there is no apprehension, much less reasonable apprehension of accused being arrested in non-bailable offence.

**Therefore, the application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed as being non-maintainable.**

Copy of the order be sent to Ld. Defence counsel through official email.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:46:15 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Sachin Kumar**

**FIR No: 280/19**

**U/s 420/120B IPC r/w Section 66 of Information and Technology Act**

**PS: Timarpur (Crime Branch)**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.**

**Sh. Ram Singh Baliyan, Ld. Counsel for applicant.**

The case of the prosecution in nutshell is that accused along with other co-accused had entered into a criminal conspiracy for leaking the question papers (of recruitment for the post of group X and Y in armed forces) and solving the same for various candidates in lieu of money. It is further alleged that on 22.09.2019, a raid was conducted by police team on the basis of secret information and applicant/accused along with other co-accused were found solving the online question papers. Seven accused were arrested from the spot and applicant/accused Sachin along with other two accused alleged to have fled away from the spot. A lot of incriminating material viz. 14 laptops/routers etc. were recovered from the spot.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued that accused is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the instant case. It is argued that on 21.09.2019, accused had appeared in the examination conducted by Haryana

Staff Selection Commission at MM University (Old Engineering Block I(A) Mullana, District Ambala and after taking said exam, since it was not possible for the accused to reach to his house at Village Mandhana, Bhiwani, Haryana on the same day i.e. on 21.09.2019, therefore, he had stayed at his friend's house at F-84/85, Gandhi Vihar, opposite Nehru Vihar, New Delhi. It is further argued that a raid was conducted by police on next day and applicant fled away from the spot due to fear. It is argued that accused has nothing to do with present crime and has been falsely implicated.

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has opposed the application for anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations against the accused are grave and serious. It is argued that the custodial interrogation of the accused is essential to unearth the whole conspiracy.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

Hon'ble High of Delhi in the case of **Homi Rajvansh Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation, 185 (2011) DLT 774** has held as follows:

*"There is a perceptible difference in the results of the interrogation when a person who has an order of anticipatory bail in his pocket and goes to the investigation agency. He is bound not to cooperate and not to give the correct answer to the questions put to him to reach at the bottom of the case as against the person who is in custody or who does not have the protection of the anticipatory bail."*

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.09.11  
15:45:26  
+0530



In State (CBI) Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 Cri. LJ 4414, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:

*"Success in such interrogation would allude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual."*

The allegations against accused are quite grave and serious. The presence of accused at the spot is admitted. The plea as taken by accused justifying his presence (at the spot) does not disclose good ground to be entertained as this court can take judicial notice of the fact that geographically, for reaching his native town at Village Mandhan, Bhiwani, Haryana, accused was not required to travel all the way to Delhi at the spot of incident.

Therefore, considering the totality of the circumstances of the case and since custodial interrogation of accused would be required to unearth the whole conspiracy and for effective investigation, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to applicant Sachin Kumar. **Accordingly, the instant application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed.**

Copy of the order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/ jail superintendent/IO/SHO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

I may clarify that nothing expressed herein shall tantamount to an expression on the merit of present case.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:45:35 +0530

**State Vs. Rohit Mundra**

**FIR No: 140/18**

**U/s 307/34 IPC and 25/54/59 of Arms Acts**

**PS: Sarai Rohilla**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is an application for early hearing of pending application for grant of bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Jaiveer Singh Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for applicant.**

**Heard. Considered.**

**In the facts and circumstances of the case, the application seeking grant of regular bail is taken up today for disposal.**

**Ld. Counsel for accused has argued that accused/applicant Rohit Mundra is in custody since more than one and a half years. It is further argued that the applicant is a young person aged about 28 years and he is the sole bread earner of his family. It is further argued that the complainant has made material improvement in his testimony and therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the case, accused deserves to be granted bail. It is further argued that one of the co-accused namely Varun Sharma has already been granted bail by Hon'ble High Court, therefore, applicant also deserves to be granted bail on the ground of parity.**

**ANUJ  
AGRAWAL**  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:44:35 +0530

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that allegations against the accused are grave and serious and he may threaten the remaining two eye witnesses who are to be examined.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the relevant record.

Trial in the instant case is still going on and therefore, it would be premature to examine the sufficiency/probative value of the evidence at this stage. Moreover, charges having been framed against the applicant, the accusation cannot be said to be groundless. A deep and critical analysis of evidence is not necessary at this stage.

In the case of *Vaman Narain Ghiya v. State of Rajasthan (2009) 2 SCC 281*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:

*"While considering an application for bail, detailed discussion of the evidence and elaborate documentation of the merits is to be avoided. This requirement stems from the desirability that no party should have the impression that his case has been pre-judged. Existence of a prima facie case is only to be considered. Elaborate analysis or exhaustive exploration of the merits is not required."*

In the case of *State of Orissa vs Mahimananda Mishra Crl. Appeal No. 1175/2018 decided on 18.09.2018*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while setting aside an order of grant of bail, observed as follows :

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date  
2020.08.11  
15:44:43 +0530

*“It is also well settled that the Court must not go deep into merits of the matter while considering an application for bail. All that needs to be established from the record is the existence of a prima facie case against the accused. Keeping in mind the aforementioned principles, we are of the view that the High Court was not justified in going into the evidence on record in such a depth which amounts to ascertaining the probability of the conviction of the accused.”*

Accused cannot claim any parity with co-accused Varun Sharma as it has been specifically observed by Hon'ble High Court (at para 8 of order dated 11.03.2020) that *“This court is of the prima facie view that the role attributed to the petitioner is different from the alleged role of Rohit Mundra or Ashish Mittal. Ashish Mittal had allegedly called Jassu on his phone searching for Charanjit Singh and Rohit Mundra is alleged to inflicted the injuries.”*

The role of applicant is distinct from co-accused Varun Sharma. The bail application of other co-accused Ashish Mittal has already been dismissed by this court vide order dated 02.07.2020. The role of applicant/accused Rohit Mundra is graver than said accused as former is main assailant.

In light of aforesaid reasons and considering the gravity of allegations, **I do not find any cogent ground to release the applicant Rohit Mundra on bail. The application for bail is accordingly dismissed.**

Copy of this order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for applicant through official email. Copy of this order be sent to concerned jail superintendent for information.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
By ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:44:56 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Rajesh @ Raju**

**FIR No: 280/20**

**U/s 392/397/411 IPC**

**PS: Wazirabad**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is fresh application for grant of bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Reply filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

Ld. Defence counsel has vehemently argued that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and has nothing to do with present crime. It is argued that there is contradiction in the version of complainant and, therefore, accused deserves to be granted bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that allegations against the accused/applicant are grave and serious and the investigation is still at nascent stage. It is argued that accused may threaten the witnesses, if enlarged on bail.

I have heard the rival contentions and perused the record.

The case of the prosecution in nutshell is that on 23.07.2020 at about 05.15 pm, applicant Rajesh @ Raju robbed the complainant of cash amount of Rs. 55,000/- and three mobile phones after showing him a pistol like object. On being chased by complainant and other public persons, the applicant was apprehended at the spot and robbed property along with pistol like object and a knife was recovered from his possession.

The allegations against accused are grave and serious. Investigation is still at nascent stage. The accused has been apprehended at the spot itself along with robbed property and a knife. The contentions of defence i.e. false implication and inconsistent version of complainant can only be tested during course of investigation and trial and not at this stage.

In the case of **Masroor Vs. State of U.P. and Another 2009 (6) SCALE 358**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed:

*“There is no denying the fact that the liberty of an individual is precious and is to be zealously protected by the Courts. Nonetheless, such a protection cannot be absolute in every situation. The valuable right of liberty of an individual and the interest of the society in general has to be balanced. Liberty of a person accused of an offence would depend upon the exigencies of the case. It is possible that in a given situation, the collective interest of the community may outweigh the right of personal liberty of the individual concerned”.*

Therefore, considering the totality of the circumstances and since investigation is at nascent stage, I am not inclined to grant bail to applicant/accused Rajesh @ Raju. **Accordingly, the application seeking regular bail stands dismissed.**

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate, jail superintendent/ Investigating Officer/SHO/Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail for information.

I may clarify that nothing expressed herein shall tantamount to an expression on the merit of present case.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:44:19 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020



**State Vs. Nabeel**

**FIR No: 140/19**

**U/s 302/147/149/34 IPC**

**PS: Daryaganj**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is fresh application for grant of interim bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Jitendra Sethi, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Reply filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

Applicant is seeking interim bail on the ground that his marriage is fixed for 25.08.2020 and his reception ceremony is to take place on 05.09.2020. IO has sought some time for verifying the factum of marriage/reception of applicant and the annexed documents.

In these circumstances, let further report be filed by concerned SHO/IO after verifying the said averments.

Put up for arguments on 18.08.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:43:24 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Manish**

**FIR No: 317/17**

**U/s 307/452 IPC**

**PS: Pahar Ganj**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is an application for sending intimation to Jail Authorities regarding extension of interim bail of accused Manish Kumar.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Pulkit Jain, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Vide instant application, the applicant is seeking intimation to Jail Authorities regarding extension of interim bail of applicant in terms of directions dated 04.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court in W.P.(C) 3080/2020, Court on its own motion Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & anr.

Heard. Considered.

In my considered view, no such separate intimation is required to be sent to Jail Authorities as the said authorities are bound to follow the directions of Hon'ble High Court.

**The instant application stands disposed of accordingly.**

Copy of the order be sent to Ld. Defence Counsel through official email.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:43:08 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Deepak @ Deepu**

**FIR No: 91/20**

**U/s 302/34 IPC**

**PS: Gulabi Bagh**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is fresh application for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.**

**Sh. Jitendra Sethi, Ld. Counsel for applicant.**

**Reply filed by the IO. Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.**

**At request of Ld. Defence Counsel, matter stands adjourned for arguments on 17.08.2020.**

**ANUJ  
AGRAWAL**

Digitally  
signed by  
ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:56:06  
+0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020**

**State Vs. Anil**

**FIR No: 72/11**

**U/s 302/34 IPC**

**PS: Sadar Bazar**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is an application for grant of interim bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.**

**None for applicant.**

Reply filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

It is informed by Reader of this court that Ld. Counsel for applicant has sought adjournment on the ground of ill-health and she has requested for keeping the matter for next week.

**In these circumstances, the present application stands adjourned for 22.08.2020.**

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:42:05  
+0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)**  
**ASJ-03, Central District**  
**Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi**  
**11.08.2020**

**State Vs. Anil @ Raja**

**FIR No: 227/2016**

**U/s 304/392/397/411/34 IPC**

**PS: Burari**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is application for extension of interim bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Sher Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant.**

Reply filed by the Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

The applicant is seeking extension of interim bail, granted to him vide order dated 26.06.2020 by this court under the guidelines of High Powered Committee. In terms of the directions dated 04.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court in **W.P.(C) 3080/2020, Court on its own motion Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & anr**, the interim bail of all such applicants have already been extended by Hon'ble High Court vide a common order for a period of 45 days from date of their respective expiry. The relevant observations of Hon'ble High Court are as follows:

Digitally  
signed by  
ANUJ  
AGRÄWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:52:59  
+0530

*“ Accordingly, it is ordered that the interim bails for a period of 45 days granted to 2901 UTPs, in view of the recommendation of HPC dated 28.03.2020, 07.04.2020, 18.04.2020, 05.05.2020, 18.05.2020, 20.06.2020 and 31.07.2020 and on the basis of orders in W.P.(C) NO 2945/2020 titled as “Shobha Gupta & ors s Union of India & ors” are hereby extended by another period of 45 days from the date of their respective expiry of interim bails on the same terms and conditions”.*

In view of same, there is no necessity for filing the present application separately. Present application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent/IO and Ld. Defence counsel through official email.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:53:07  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**State Vs. Akhilesh**

**FIR No: 120/20**

**U/s 308/188/269/270/34 IPC**

**PS: Timarpur**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of the applicant.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.**

**Sh. Abhishek Rana, Ld. Counsel for applicant.**

Report from concerned Juvenile Justice Board is received. Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically. As per said report dated 06.08.2020, the date of birth of applicant/accused Akhilesh is 28.01.2001 and he has been declared as '*not a juvenile*'.

At request of Ld. APP, put up for arguments on 13.08.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally  
signed by  
ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:41:18  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**SC No. 27327/16**

**FIR No: 02/2011**

**PS: Bara Hindu Rao**

**State Vs. Anuj Mohta etc**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State

All accused persons are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today

The matter was lastly listed on 15.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for appearance of accused Zamil and Manohar and Bailable warrants were issued against accused Manohar. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters). .Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 02.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:47:45 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020



**SC No. 27347/16**

**FIR No: 314/2011**

**PS: Crime Branch (North Delhi)**

**State Vs. Alam @ Saleem & ors**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.**

Accused Alam @ Saleem, accused Shahbuddin, accused Yasin and accused Farman are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 11.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for final arguments. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters). Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 29.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:47:57 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**SC No. 63/2018**

**FIR No: 74/2016**

**PS: Hauz Qazi**

**State Vs. Sunita Kashyap etc**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.**

All accused persons are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 18.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for appearance of accused persons. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters). Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 03.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:48:05 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

SC No. 63/2018

FIR No: 74/2016

PS: Hauz Qazi

State Vs. Sunita Kashyap etc

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

All accused persons are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 18.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for appearance of accused persons. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters). Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 03.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:48:05 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)

ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**CR NO: 507/2019**

**Mohd. Khalik Khan vs ACP & ors**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

Present: None for parties.

The matter was lastly listed on 07.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for appearance of counsel of revisionist. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters). Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 03.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:48:13 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**CR NO: 764/2019**

**Kalpana Srivastava vs State**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

Present: None for revisionist.

The matter was lastly listed on 02.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for issuance of notice to respondent. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters). Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 04.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:48:22 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

SC No. 158/2020

FIR No: 168/2018

PS: Hauz Qazi

State Vs. Sushil Kumar etc

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

All accused persons are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 11.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for consideration . No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 05.11.2020.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:48:32  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

CR NO: 162/2020

Vijender Singh @ Raju Parcha vs The State of NCT of Delhi & ors

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for revisionist

The matter was lastly listed on 13.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for issuance of notice of the revision petition to respondent. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 06.11.2020.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:48:41  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**CR NO: 173/2020**

**Pankaj Jain vs State**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

Present: None for revisionist

The matter was lastly listed on 03.04.2020 after suspension of physical functioning of district courts. The date was fixed by filing section after assignment. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for appearance of revisionist. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 04.11.2020.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:48:49  
+0530  
(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020



**CR no. 174/2020**

**Deepanshu Goel & ors vs State & ors**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

**Present:       None for revisionist**

The matter was lastly listed on 03.04.2020 after suspension of physical functioning of district courts. The date was fixed by filing section after assignment. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for appearance of revisionist. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 04.11.2020.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:48:58  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

SC No. 27574/16  
FIR No: 134/2013  
PS: Kashmere Gate  
State Vs. Rinku Singh & ors

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State

All accused persons are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today

Sh. Pulkit Jain, Ld. Counsel for accused Rinku

The matter was lastly listed on 18.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for PE. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic' . Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 05.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:49:08 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

SC No. 28341/16

FIR No: 385/15

PS: DBG Road

State Vs. Mratunjay Kumar

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused is on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 11.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for PE. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 06.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:49:15 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

SC No. 27514/16

FIR No: 423/15

PS: Prashad Nagar

State Vs. Anshul

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Anshul, accused Yogesh @ Takkal and accused Rohan not produced from JC

The matter was lastly listed on 25.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for PE. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic' . Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 29.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:49:22 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

SC No. 28428/16

FIR No: 96/2013

PS: DBG Road

State Vs. Ravi Saxena @ Babu

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Ravi Saxena and accused Ashok Jagia are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

Accused Pappi @ Rahul not produced from JC

The matter was lastly listed on 11.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for further proceedings. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 07.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:49:30 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**SC No. 28804/2016**

**FIR No: 172/2016**

**PS: Paharganj**

**State Vs. Mohd. Shahdat Ali**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.**

**Accused Shahdat Ali not produced from JC**

The matter was lastly listed on 19.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for PE. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 05.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:49:36 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**SC No. 798/2018**

**FIR No: 64/2018**

**PS: Prashad Nagar**

**State Vs. Ravi Kumar**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

**Present:** Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Ravi and accused Deepak are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 07.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for PE. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 03.11.2020.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:49:43  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

**SC No. 28225/2016**

**FIR No: 72/2011**

**PS: Sadar Bazar**

**State Vs. Naresh& ors**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

**Present:** Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Naresh, accused Anil, accused Ashish @ Pawan not produced from JC

Accused Kishan @ Vicky not present. He is on interim bail vide order dated 01.06.2020

The matter was lastly listed on 03.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for final arguments. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 26.10.2020.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:49:51 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020



CR NO 58186/2016

Kishan Lal vs The State

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for revisionist

Sh.Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent

The matter was lastly listed on 18.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on revision petition. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 07.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
By ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:49:59 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

CR NO: 355/2019

M/s Shivam Jewellers vs M/s Shree Balaji Jewellers

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for parties

The matter was lastly listed on 23.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on revision petition. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters). Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 05.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:50:07  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

CA NO: 272/2019

Brijesh Sharma vs Avdesh Jain

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for parties

The matter was lastly listed on 30.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 03.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.11  
15:50:16  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

CA NO: 273/2019

Brijesh Sharma vs Avdesh Jain

11.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for parties

The matter was lastly listed on 30.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 03.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.11  
15:50:23 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020

CA NO: 283/2019

**Avdesh Jain vs Brijesh Sharma**

**11.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

**Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 26/DHC/2020 dated 30.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.**

Present: None for parties

The matter was lastly listed on 30.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed alongwith connected appeal titled as Brijesh Sharma vs Avdesh Jain. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.19456-53/G.K./DJ(HQs.)/THC/Delhi dated 07.08.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge (Headquarters).. Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 03.11.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date  
2020.08.11  
15:50:31  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.08.2020