

CA No. 111/20
Vasudev Khattar Vs. Kanta @ Kanta Khattar

14.08.2020

Through Video Conferencing

This is fresh appeal received by way of assignment. It be checked and registered.

Present: None for appellant.

Since no urgency is pleaded, hence put up for consideration on
19.10.2020.

Digitally
signed by
ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:41:30
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

CR NO: 522/19

Mohd. Saleem vs The State

14.08.2020

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 27.01.2020 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 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 05.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:45:06 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

CA NO: 375/2019

Mahenoor vs Anique Abdullah

14.08.2020

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 appearance of appellant. 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 07.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:45:14 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

CA No: 376/2019

Md. Anique Abdullah vs Mahe Noor @ Eirum

14.08.2020

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 appearance of appellant. 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 07.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:45:21
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

CA NO: 400/2019

Ankit Dhingra vs Ritu

14.08.2020

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

The matter was lastly listed on 20.03.2020 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 04.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:45:28 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

CA NO: 489/2019

Pooja Suri vs Durjan Singh

14.08.2020

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

The matter was lastly listed on 23.01.2020 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 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 appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 02.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:45:35
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

CR NO: 26/2020

R.B Enterprises through Aveent Goyal vs State of NCT of Delhi

14.08.2020

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 21.03.2020 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 revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 26.10.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:45:42
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

CA NO: 26/2020

M/s Ranjan Electricals & Anr vs State & ors

14.08.2020

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 no.1

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 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 28.10.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally
signed by
ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:45:49
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

SC NO: 104/2019

FIR No: 432/2013

PS : DBG Road

State vs Kishan

14.08.2020

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 Kishan is on bail prior to lockdown period

The matter was lastly listed on 20.03.2020 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 admission-denial of documents. 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:
2020.08.14
15:45:55 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 10/16

PS: Rajender Nagar

U/S: 302/396/120B/412/201 IPC

State Vs. Rajender @ Raju

14.08.2020

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

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

Sh. Surendra Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

Ld. Counsel for applicant is seeking interim bail for a period of 45 days on the ground that family members of applicant are in very pitiable condition. It is further argued that minor daughter of applicant aged 10 years has recently become a victim of offence U/s 376 IPC and Section 4 of POCSO and FIR No. 475/2020 dated 05.08.2020, PS Bharat Nagar has been registered in this regard. It is further argued that wife and mother of the applicant are being pressurized by family members of accused in the said FIR to withdraw the said case. It is argued that presence of applicant is required to take care of his minor daughter and for ensuring safety of his family members.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.14
15:38:19 +0530

Contd/-

Per Contra, Ld. APP for State has opposed the application for interim bail on the ground that the allegations against applicant are grave and serious.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The allegations against applicant are grave and serious as he has been charge-sheeted along with other co-accused *inter-alia* for offences U/s 302/396 IPC for having committed dacoity and murder of as many as three victims. IO has reported previous involvement of applicant in number of other criminal cases also. The plea taken by applicant for grant of interim bail i.e. for taking care of his minor daughter who is victim (in FIR No. 475/2020) does not disclose good grounds to be entertained as it is evident from the report of IO that there are other members i.e. mother, wife and sister in his family to take care of his minor daughter.

In the matter of **Ather Parvez Vs. State** (Crl. Ref. No. 01/2015 Date of decision 26.02.2016), it has been observed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court that:

"....The trial or the appellate courts after conviction are entitled to grant "interim bail" to the accused/convict when exceptional and extra-ordinary circumstances would justify this indulgence. The power is to be sparingly used, when intolerable grief and suffering in the given facts may justify temporary release..."

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.14
15:38:31 +0530

Contd/-

-3-

FIR No: 10/16

State Vs. Rajender @ Raju

It is a settled principle of law that interim bail can only be granted in exceptional circumstances. In the instant application, there are no exceptional circumstances to release the applicant/accused on interim bail. The allegations against accused are quite grave and serious.

In light of aforesaid reasons and considering the gravity of allegations, I am not inclined to grant interim bail to accused Rajender @ Raju. **The application seeking interim bail is accordingly dismissed.**

However, considering the concern raised in the instant application, I deem it fit that the matter be brought to the notice of concerned Secretary, District Legal Services Authority (DLSA, North-West) with a request to provide services of support person/Legal Aid Counsel to the victim, if not already done.

Needless to say, that the concerned SHO, PS Bharat Nagar shall ensure proper safety and security of the victim and other witnesses in case FIR No. 475/2020, PS Bharat Nagar.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Secretary DLSA, North-West, concerned jail superintendent, SHO/IO and Ld. Defence Counsel through official email.

ANUJ
AGRAWALDigitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:38:46
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 10/16

PS: Rajinder Nagar

U/S: 302/396/120B/412/201 IPC

State Vs. Rajan Singh @ Abhishek @ Dewan

14.08.2020

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

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

Sh. Parveen Dabas, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

The applicant is seeking interim bail for a period of two months on the ground of his precarious medical condition.

Let a detail report regarding the medical condition of applicant be called from concerned Jail Superintendent for 19.08.2020.

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:37:56
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 316/20

PS: Burari

U/S: 420/468/471/120B IPC

State Vs. Brijesh Kumar Sharma

14.08.2020

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

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

Sh. Paramjeet, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

IO/SI Yogender.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

Part arguments heard.

Ld. Defence Counsel has requested for grant of some more time for addressing remaining arguments as he wants to file certain documents in support of his case. Ld. APP for State also submits that he needs certain clarification from IO to address remaining arguments. IO also seeks some time to assist this court.

In these circumstances, matter stands adjourned for remaining arguments on 01.09.2020. In the meantime, no coercive steps shall be taken against applicant/accused till next date of hearing.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:36:24
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 418/19

PS: Burari

U/S: 380 IPC

State Vs. Manish

14.08.2020

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

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

Ms. Shalu Yadav, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Sh. S. Tyagi, Ld. Counsel for complainant.

IO/ASI Chander Pal.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

The reply filed by IO is vague and it is evident from the reply that no investigation worth the name has been conducted in the instant case so far.

Ld. Defence Counsel has vehemently argued that both the eye-witnesses who had allegedly seen accused committing the alleged offence have already given their complaint to concerned DCP denying their presence at the spot at the time of alleged incident. On query, IO submits that the said witnesses are yet to be

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.14
15:37:15 +0530

Contd/-

examined and he requires at least one week time to file fresh reply after recording the version of eye-witnesses.

In these circumstances and at request of State, matter stands adjourned for further arguments on 26.08.2020. In the meantime, no coercive steps shall be taken against applicant till next date of hearing.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally
signed by
ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:37:05
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 278/20

PS: Burari

U/S: 498A/306 IPC

State Vs. Rahul

14.08.2020

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

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

Sh. Vivek Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

After arguing for some time, Ld. Counsel for accused wishes to withdraw the present application. Accordingly the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

**Digitally
signed by
ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:37:33
+0530**

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020**

FIR No: 418/19

PS: Burari

U/S: 380 IPC

State Vs. Ram Chand

14.08.2020

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

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

Ms. Shalu Yadav, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Sh. S. Tyagi, Ld. Counsel for complainant.

IO/ASI Chander Pal.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

The reply filed by IO is vague and it is evident from the reply that no investigation worth the name has been conducted in the instant case so far.

Ld. Defence Counsel has vehemently argued that both the eye-witnesses who had allegedly seen accused committing the alleged offence have already given their complaint to concerned DCP denying their presence at the spot at the time of alleged incident. On query, IO submits that the said witnesses are yet to be examined and he requires at least one week time to file fresh reply after recording

Contd/-

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:39:21
+0530

the version of eye-witnesses.

In these circumstances and at request of State, matter stands adjourned for further arguments on 26.08.2020. In the meantime, no coercive steps shall be taken against applicant till next date of hearing.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally
signed by
ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:39:10
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 8/20

PS: Bara Hindu Rao

U/S: 498A, 406, 34 IPC

State Vs. Sajjan

14.08.2020

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

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

Sh. Aditya Vashishath, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

Bail application of co-accused, who is son of applicant, is listed for 21.08.2020. List the present application along with said application on 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.

Digitally
signed by
ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:40:12
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 57/2020

PS: Maurice Nagar

U/S: 279/337/304/304A IPC

State Vs. Tushar

14.08.2020

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

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

Sh. Vivek Aggarwal and Sh. Pradeep Rana, Ld. Counsels for applicant.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

Report in terms of the directions dated 13.08.2020 has been received from concerned Jail Authorities. IO has also filed copy of case summary of applicant from concerned hospital. Copy supplied to Ld. Defence Counsel electronically.

The report filed by Medical Officer Incharge, Central Jail No.5 Dispensary, Tihar is as follows:

".. As per MLC inmate had alleged history of RTA, on medical examination patient had severe acute abdominal pain with guarding & rigidity with history of loss of consciousness. At about 08.30 PM on same day patient referred to DDU Hospital (First referral unit of Central Jail Hospital) on urgent basis. Inmate was advised to undergo emergency surgery at DDUH but inmate patient denied consent for surgery, thus DDUH sent him back to CJ-05 on basis of LAMA (leaving against medical advice)

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:42:06
+0530

Contd/-

On 11/08/2020 at 05.35 ARREST MEMO, inmate again referred back to DDUH for further management & surgical intervention.

At present Patient is admitted in DDU Hospital, patient has not yet returned in CJ-05. "

The copy of case summary under signature of concerned Doctor, DDU Hospital reveals that the surgery of the applicant has been performed and presently he is in ICU in critical condition and requires prolonged ICU/HDU care.

At this stage, it is submitted by Ld. Defence Counsel that his sole concern is the health condition of applicant and he is restricting his prayer to the extent that the applicant may be permitted to be treated further at a specialist private hospital of his choice at his own expenses.

Ld. APP for State does not oppose the said prayer of defence. However, he submits that the said prayer be granted subject to advice of concerned Medical Superintendent, DDU Hospital.

In the facts and circumstances of the present case and considering the submissions made today, applicant is permitted to get himself treated at any hospital within city of Delhi of his own choice at his own expenses. Needless to say, the concerned Jail Superintendent shall ensure proper safety and precaution during

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:41:52
+0530

Contd/-

transit and treatment of applicant as latter is in judicial custody. I may clarify that the said permission is, however, subject to advice of concerned Medical Superintendent, DDU Hospital. Ld. Counsel has requested that parents of applicant may be permitted to meet him. The said request for meeting may be considered by concerned authorities as per rules and protocol.

With these observations, the application stands disposed of.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent, as well as concerned Medical Superintendent, DDU Hospital through SHO/IO. Copy of the order be also sent to Ld. Defence Counsel through official email.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally
signed by
ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:42:16
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020

FIR No: 845/15

PS: Burari

U/S: 308/34 IPC

State Vs. Ved Prakash Mishra @ Bhushan

14.08.2020

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

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

Sh. Monty Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing by means of Webex.

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

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of 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 submitted that accused is in custody since 19.07.2020 and is no more required for investigation. It is further argued that co-accused Om Prakash Mishra @ Roshan is already on regular bail, therefore, applicant may also be granted 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 argued that accused has been absconding and did not join the investigation for a long period. It

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:40:56
+0530

Contd/-

is further argued that the applicant/accused is the main assailant and, therefore, cannot claim any parity with co-accused.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The case of prosecution in nutshell is that on 28.06.2015 at about 8:00 PM, applicant/accused Ved Prakash Mishra alongwith other co-accused had assaulted the victim with an iron rod. The matter pertains to year 2015 however, admittedly accused did not join the investigation for a long period. Though, investigating agency should have been more vigilant in conclusion of investigation qua applicant as per law, however, accused cannot take any benefit due to lapse of investigating agency more so when he himself did not make any attempt to join investigation at any stage (prior to his arrest) despite being specifically named in FIR and despite lapse of more than 5 years since date of present incident. The accused has been specifically named in FIR and is the main assailant. He cannot claim any parity with co-accused as latter had surrendered before court whereas applicant was evading for long.

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

"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".

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.14
15:41:05 +0530

Contd/-

Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of the offence, role of accused and since investigation qua him is still at nascent stage,, I am not inclined to grant bail to applicant. **Accordingly, the instant application seeking regular 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:
2020.08.14
15:41:12
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
14.08.2020