

Bail Application No: 839/20

FIR No.:- 35/20

PS: Subzi Mandi

Under Section: 498-A/406/34 IPC

State vs Tarun Chugh @ Tarun

13.08.2020

Through video conferencing

This is an application under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.
Sh. Vishnu Kumar, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant

Reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is argued that complainant, being wife of applicant, has filed present false FIR due to on going matrimonial disputes between parties. It is further argued that accused/applicant has clean antecedents and therefore, deserves to be granted anticipatory bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Ld. APP for the State has argued that in view of reply of IO, there is no reasonable apprehension of applicant being arrested in the instant case as no such arrest was effected by IO when applicant joined the investigation. It is further argued that if need arises, applicant shall be arrested only after permission of concerned DCP.

IO has reported that applicant has joined the investigation alongwith other co-accused. It has further been reported that applicant was not arrested and after interrogation, he was let off.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:10:06 +0530

contd..2/-

Bail Application No: 839/20

FIR No.:- 35/20

PS: Subzi Mandi

Under Section: 498-A/406/34 IPC

State vs Tarun Chugh @ Tarun

Heard. Record perused.

At request of applicant/accused, issue notice to complainant through concerned SHO/IO for exploring the possibility of settlement through mediation for 18.08.2020. Till then, no coercive steps shall be taken by investigating agency against the applicant/accused.

Put up for further hearing on 18.08.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:10:14 +0530

Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 842/2020

FIR No.:- 59/14

PS: Gulabi Bagh

Under Section: 392/394/34 IPC

State vs Rahul

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Praveen Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Heard. Record including the relevant trial court record (sent by Reader electronically) perused.

The applicant was initially on bail in the instant case. However, thereafter, he stopped appearing and consequently, coercive steps including process under section 82 Cr.P.C was issued against him. Accused was taken into custody by Ld. Trial Court vide order dated 23.09.2019 and since then he is in custody.

Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the present case and considering the period of detention and situation of current Pandemic, I am of the view that no purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind bars more so, when the trial may get prolonged due to current pandemic. **Accordingly, accused/applicant Rahul is admitted to bail on furnishing Personal Bond and Surety Bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Ld. Magistrate/Ld. Duty Magistrate.**

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

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:11:00 +0530

Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 840/2020
FIR No.:- 198/20
PS:- Subzi Mandi
Under Section:- 356/379/411/34 IPC
State vs Kapil @ Kapil Dev

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. P.K Garg, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO). Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

After arguing some time, Ld. Defence counsel seeks permission to withdraw present application with liberty to move interim bail application afresh before concerned court under the guidelines dated 18.05.2020 of High Powered Committee.

In these circumstances and at request, **present application stands dismissed as withdrawn** with liberty to move interim bail application afresh before concerned court of Ld. Magistrate. Needless to say that if any such application is moved, the same shall be considered by Ld. Magistrate as per law.

Copy of order be sent to SHO/IO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:11:18 +0530
Anuj Agrawal
ASJ-03/Central
THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 843/2020
FIR No.:- 8/20
PS:- Bara Hindu Rao
Under Section:- 498 A/406/34 IPC
State vs Pankaj Kumar

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is an application under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Aditya, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused

Reply filed by Investigating Officer(IO). Copy of supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Defence counsel submits that accused wants to explore the possibility of settlement through mediation. Since the accused wants to explore the possibility of mediation, issue notice to the complainant through concerned SHO/IO for 21.08.2020.

In the meantime, no coercive steps shall be taken against the accused/applicant by investigating agency till next date of hearing.

Copy of order be sent to SHO/IO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:11:39 +0530
Anuj Agrawal
ASJ-03/Central
THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 841/2020

FIR No.:- 293/20

PS:- Burari

Under Section:- 399/402/411/120B/34 IPC r/w 25 Arms Act

State vs Amit Tyagi @ Lala

13.08.2020

Through video conferencing

This is an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of bail filed on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Deepak Ghai, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Fresh reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO). Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further argued that alleged recovery has been planted upon accused/applicant. It is argued that there is no admissible evidence against applicant/accused qua allegations of 399/402/120B IPC. It is further argued that accused is no more required for the purpose of investigation. It is forcefully argued that co-accused Ranjeet and Satender have already been granted bail by this court vide order dated 06.08.2020 and therefore, accused also deserves to be granted bail on the ground of parity in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Ld. APP for the state has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that allegations against the accused are grave and serious. It is argued that applicant/accused cannot claim parity with co-accused Ranjeet and Satender as recovery of stolen vehicle and illegal arm has also been made from accused.

I have heard the rival contentions and perused the record.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:12:12 +0530

contd..2/-

Bail Application No: 841/2020

FIR No.:- 293/20

PS:- Burari

Under Section:- 399/402/411/120B/34 IPC r/w 25 Arms Act

State vs Amit Tyagi @ Lala

Recovery of stolen vehicle and fire arm has already been effected from accused and he is no more required for investigation. The remaining allegations under Section 399/402/120-B IPC are general and vague in nature. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the present case and current Pandemic situation, I am of the view that accused/applicant deserves bail in instant case. Accordingly, accused/applicant Amit Tyagi @ Lala is admitted to bail on furnishing Personal Bond and Surety Bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Ld. Magistrate/Ld. Duty Magistrate.

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

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL** Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:12:19 +0530
Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 1788

FIR No.:- 120/20

PS:- Timarpur

Under Section:- 308/188/269/270/34 IPC

State vs Akhilesh

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of applicant/accused.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Abhishek Rana, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO). Copy supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is argued that accused/applicant is only bread earner of his family and his family members are on the verge of starvation. It is further argued that accused/applicant is a young boy having clean antecedent and therefore, deserves to be granted bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case. It is forcefully argued that all the remaining accused have already been granted regular bail and therefore, accused also deserves bail on the ground of parity.

Per contra Ld. APP for State has opposed the instant application on the ground that allegations against the accused are grave and serious. It is further argued that custodial interrogation of the accused is required for effective investigation of instant case.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The case of prosecution in nutshell is that on 12.05.2020 at about 6:00 PM,

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:12:46 +0530

contd..2/-

Bail Application No: 1788

FIR No.:- 120/20

PS:- Timarpur

Under Section:- 308/188/269/270/34 IPC

State vs Akhilesh

applicant/accused Akhilesh alongwith other co-accused assaulted the complainant. The accused has been specifically named in the FIR and he has played an active role in commission of present crime as he had caught hold of victim when latter was attacked by co-accused.

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."

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 the 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."

Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of the offence, role of accused and since custodial interrogation of accused would be required for effective investigation, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to applicant. Accused cannot claim any parity with co-accused as latter were, admittedly, granted regular bail and not any anticipatory bail. **Accordingly, the instant application seeking**

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:12:58 +0530

contd..3/-

-3-

Bail Application No: 1788

FIR No.:- 120/20

PS:- Timarpur

Under Section:- 308/188/269/270/34 IPC

State vs Akhilesh

anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

Copy of the order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/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

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:13:04 +0530

Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

FIR No.:- 96/13
PS:- DBG Road
Under Section:- 328/379 IPC
State vs Rahul Gupta @ Pappi

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Diwakar Chaudhary, Ld. Legal Aid Counsel for accused

Report from jail superintendent received. As per same, after being produced before this court on 19.09.2018, accused was sent to jail. It has further been reported that a clarification was sought from Ld. Predecessor of this court regarding status of accused and it was accordingly clarified on 24.09.2018 that "accused has been arrested as P.O in instant case on 19.09.2018".

Heard. Considered.

The accused was initially on bail in the instant case, however, later on when he stopped appearing, he was declared a proclaimed Offender and was taken into custody. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the present case and considering the long period of detention and situation of current Pandemic, I am of the view that no purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind bars more so, when the trial may get prolonged due to current pandemic. **Accordingly, accused/applicant Rahul Gupta @ Pappi is admitted to bail on furnishing Personal Bond and Surety Bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- to the satisfaction of concerned Ld. Duty Magistrate.**

Copy of this order be sent to concerned SHO/IO/ concerned jail superintendent and Ld. Legal Aid Counsel through e-mail.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:13:38 +0530
Anuj Agrawal
ASJ-03/Central
THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 838/20

FIR No.:- 256/20

PS:- Burari

Under Section:- 448/420/468/471/120B IPC

State vs Ram Milan

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is an application under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Naman Raj Thakur, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO) . Copy supplied to other side electronically.

Request for adjournment made by the counsel on the ground that arguing counsel is not available today.

At request, put up for arguments on 21.08.2020.

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:13:56
+0530

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 1917/20

FIR No.:- 271/20

PS:- Burari

Under Section:- 420/411 IPC

State vs Ashu @ Gaurav

Bail Application no: 1918/20

FIR No.:- 271/20

PS:- Burari

Under Section:- 420/411 IPC

State vs Vikrant @ Bony

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has argued for dismissal of bail on the ground that the allegations against the accused are grave and serious as the applicants had induced the complainant, a blind student, to handover his debit card on the pretext of helping him and later on, illegally used the same and spent an amount of Rs.54,500/- using said card. It is further argued that accused Vikrant @ Bony is involved in one more case of similar nature. On these grounds, Ld. APP requests for dismissal of instant applications.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The case of the prosecution in brief is that both the accused/applicants in furtherance of their common intention obtained possession of debit card of the complainant deceitfully and thereafter withdrew cash of Rs. 21,000/- and also used the same for purchase of various articles from different places. From the possession of the applicant Vikrant @ Bonny cash of Rs. 15,000/- and debit card of the complainant were recovered. At the instance of the applicant, co-accused Ashu @ Gaurav was arrested and articles/clothes purchased by him with using said debit card were recovered. The report as well as CCTV footage filed today shows presence of accused Vikrant @ Bony in one of the ATMs and presence both the accused at a store where from part of the articles were purchased by accused using debit card of complainant.

The allegations against accused are grave and serious in nature as they

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:14:25 +0530

Contd..3/-

Bail Application No: 1917/20
FIR No.:- 271/20
PS:- Burari
Under Section:- 420/411 IPC
State vs Ashu @ Gaurav

Bail Application no: 1918/20
FIR No.:- 271/20
PS:- Burari
Under Section:- 420/411 IPC
State vs Vikrant @ Bony

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

These are two separate applications under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail filed on behalf of applicants/accused

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Kapil Jain, Ld. Counsel for both accused/applicants.
IO SI Ashish Sharma (through VC)

By this common order, I shall decide two separate applications filed on behalf of accused Ashu @ Gaurav and accused Vikrant @ Bony for grant of bail.

Further reply by Investigating Officer (IO) alongwith copy of CCTV footage filed. Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Counsel for accused is seeking bail on the ground that the applicant/accused has entered into a settlement with the complainant and Memo of Understanding (MOU) has also been made in terms of settlement between the parties. It is further argued that as per MOU dated 29.07.2020, the family members of accused/applicant has paid Rs. 39,500/- to the complainant in terms of settlement and they are also ready to make the payment of balance amount.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:14:18 +0530

Contd..2/-

Bail Application No: 1917/20

FIR No.:- 271/20

PS:- Burari

Under Section:- 420/411 IPC

State vs Ashu @ Gaurav

Bail Application no: 1918/20

FIR No.:- 271/20

PS:- Burari

Under Section:- 420/411 IPC

State vs Vikrant @ Bony

have cheated a hapless blind complainant on the pretext of helping him. Investigation is still at nascent stage. Mere settlement with the complainant cannot be a good ground to release the applicant/accused as crime is not a profitable venture. Accused are harbouring an impression that they can earn their liberty by striking a bargain with the complainant despite indulging in such a heinous crime. It is evident that accused are attempting to interfere with course of investigation by contacting the complainant and trying to influence him. In my view, the accused may tamper with evidence or indulge in crime of similar nature, if enlarged on bail.

Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of the allegations and since investigation is at nascent stage, I am not inclined to enlarge the applicant/accused on bail. **Accordingly, applications for grant of bail moved on behalf of both the accused namely Vikrant @ Bony and accused Ashu @ Gaurav are accordingly dismissed.**

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

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: 2020.08.13
16:14:31 +0530

Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application no: 837/20

FIR No.:- 57/20

PS:- Maurice Nagar

Under Section:- 279/337/304/304 A IPC

State vs Tushar

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of interim bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Sh. Vivek Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.
IO SI Deepak in person (through VC)

Ld. Defence counsel undertakes to file vakalatnama during course of day.
Directed accordingly.

Reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO). Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Defence counsel has argued that accused/applicant is seeking interim bail for two weeks on medical grounds as his condition is critical, his intestine being completely ruptured in the present incident. It is argued that accused/applicant has to undergo a surgery due to internal bleeding.

As per report of IO, the accused/applicant was got admitted in DDU hospital by jail authorities and he has undergone an operation there for the injuries in his abdomen. It has further been reported that concerned doctor has informed that applicant is in ICU and shall remain under observation.

In the facts and circumstances of the present case, let detailed report

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:15:12 +0530

contd..2/-

Bail Application no: 837/20

FIR No.:- 57/20

PS:- Maurice Nagar

Under Section:- 279/337/304/304 A IPC

State vs Tushar

regarding medical condition of accused be filed by concerned Medical Superintendent (MS), DDU hospital and by concerned jail authorities.

Now to come up for hearing on 14.08.2020.

Considering the urgency pleaded by defence, it is expected from concerned medical superintendent, DDU hospital and jail superintendent that the report shall be filed not later than by 12 Noon tomorrow i.e. 14.08.2020.

Copy of the order be sent to concerned jail superintendent. Copy of the order be also sent to worthy MS, DDU Hospital through concerned IO for compliance. Copy be sent to Ld.Defence counsel also through official e-mail.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:15:18 +0530

Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Bail Application No: 1696

FIR No.:- 196/20

PS:- Subzi Mandi

Under Section:- 376/323/506/34 IPC

State vs Shiv

13.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is an application under Section under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
Ms Charu Kalra, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused
Sh. Anil Kumar, Ld. Counsel for prosecutrix

Ld. Defence counsel has argued for grant of bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated as he neither met complainant ever nor he has made any physical relationship with her. It is argued that accused had not infected the prosecutrix with HIV infection and rather, it was prosecutrix who had infected the accused with said disease. It is further argued that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case by complainant in order to extort money from him. It is argued that accused has nothing to do with the alleged crime and therefore, may be granted anticipatory bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has vehemently opposed the instant application on the ground that the allegations against accused are grave and serious. It is argued that accused had induced the prosecutrix to have sexual relationship with him on the false promise of marriage and thereafter dumped her. It is further argued that plea of defence, that it is prosecutrix who had infected accused with HIV, is a bundle of lies as it was accused only who was initially detected as HIV positive and later on, prosecutrix also got infected with HIV due to relationship with accused. It is further argued that custodial interrogation is required for effective investigation in the instant case.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:15:36 +0530

Contd..2/-

Bail Application No: 1696

FIR No.:- 196/20

PS:- Subzi Mandi

Under Section:- 376/323/506/34 IPC

State vs Shiv

I have heard the rival contentions and perused the record.

It is evident from record that accused has been taking contradictory plea, as on one hand, he denies ever meeting with complainant or having physical relationship with her and on the other hand, he claims that it is prosecutrix who had infected him with HIV disease. Therefore, it is clear that accused has been taking contradictory and false pleas in the instant application. The allegations against the accused are grave and serious. The contention of defence regarding false implication can only be tested only during investigation/trial and not at this stage.

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."

In State (CBI) Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 CrL 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."

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of the offence, and since custodial interrogation of accused would be required for effective investigation, I

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:15:51 +0530

contd..3/-

-3-

Bail Application No: 1696

FIR No.:- 196/20

PS:- Subzi Mandi

Under Section:- 376/323/506/34 IPC

State vs Shiv

am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to applicant. Accordingly, the instant application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

Copy of the order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/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

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:16:02 +0530

Anuj Agrawal

ASJ-03/Central

THC/Delhi/13.08.2020

Crl. Rev. No. 115/2018

Priya Singh Paul Vs. SHO & ors.

13.08.2020

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 no. 5.

None for remaining respondents.

The matter was lastly listed on 19.03.2020 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 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 and respondents, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 18.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:18:01 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

CA No. 188/2017

Rajesh Jain Vs. Om Prakash Jain

13.08.2020

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.

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 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 06.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:17:53 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

CA No. 187/2017

Rajesh Jain Vs. Om Prakash Jain

13.08.2020

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.

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 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 06.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:17:48 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

SC No. 28803/2016

FIR No: 218/2016

PS: Pahar Ganj

State Vs. Danish & ors.

13.08.2020

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 were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

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 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 07.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:17:41 +0530

ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

CA No. 54946/2016

Pramod Kumar Vs. Nawab Singh

13.08.2020

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.

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 parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:17:33 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

SC No. 28429/2016

FIR No: 25/2016

PS: Darya Ganj

State Vs. Mohd. Amir & ors.

13.08.2020

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 Mohd. Aamir is on interim bail vide order dated 09.06.2020 but he is not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 05.03.2020 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 18.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:17:25 +0530

SC No. 28260/2016

FIR No: 44/2014

PS: Bara Hindu Rao

State Vs. Mohd. Yashir Khan

13.08.2020

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 were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 10.01.2020 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 prosecution evidence. 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 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:17:21 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

SC No. 27196/2016

FIR No: 194/2010

PS: DBG Road

State Vs. Akhter & ors.

13.08.2020

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 were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

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 prosecution evidence. 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 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:17:14 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

SC No. 28136/2016

FIR No: 437/2014

PS: Pahar Ganj

State Vs. Naveen Sood & ors.

13.08.2020

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 were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 29.01.2020 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 prosecution evidence. 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 18.11.2020.

ANUJ AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:17:07 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

Crl. Rev. No. 171/2020

Kallu Khan Vs. State of NCT of Delhi

13.08.2020

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 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 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 11.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:17:01 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

Crl. Rev. No. 553/2019

Sri Ram Vs. Meena @ Beena

13.08.2020

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.

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 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 parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 12.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:16:54 +0530

Crl. Rev. No. 468/2019

Rajiv Andhiwal Vs. The SHO

13.08.2020

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.

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 arguments on revision. 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 11.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:16:48 +0530

Crl. Rev. No.426/2019

Premjit Singh Chadha Vs. Amar Steel Syndicate

13.08.2020

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.

The matter was lastly listed on 22.02.2020 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. 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 09.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:16:42 +0530

Crl. Rev. no. 422/2019

Malika Sharma Vs. The State & ors.

FIR No. 393/2014

PS I.P.Estate

13.08.2020

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 no.1.

None for respondent no. 2.

The matter was lastly listed on 11.02.2020 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 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 and respondent no.2, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 11.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

(Anuj Agrawal)

ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi

13.08.2020

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:16:36 +0530

Crl. Rev. no. 285/2019

Mohinder Singh Vs. Universal Buildwell Pvt. Ltd.

13.08.2020

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.

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 parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 10.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:16:27
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

SC No. 324/2019

FIR No: 113/2018

PS: Railway Main Delhi

State Vs. Deepu Kumar & ors.

13.08.2020

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 Deepu and Pradeep not produced from J.C.

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

The matter was lastly listed on 06.03.2020 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 charge. 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 09.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
16:16:20 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

CA No. 314/2019

Neeraj Mahendru Vs. State

13.08.2020

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 appellant.

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

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 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 appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 19.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.13
11:11:41 +0530

CA No. 268/2019

Bharat Rathore Vs. The State

13.08.2020

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 appellant.

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

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 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 appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 19.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.13
16:18:07 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)

ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
13.08.2020