

**State Vs. Prem Singh**

**FIR No: 07/2017**

**U/s 302/34 IPC**

**PS: Sadar Bazar**

**05.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

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

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

**Sh. Archit Kaushik, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.**

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

The applicant is seeking extension of interim bail, granted to him vide order dated 23.06.2020 of this court.

In terms of the directions dated 13.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court in **W.P.(C) 3037/2020, 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 till 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2020. The relevant observations of Hon'ble High Court are as follows:

*“ 5. In view of the above, we hereby further extend the implementation of the directions contained in our order dated 25<sup>th</sup> March, 2020 and 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2020 and 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2020 till 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2020 with the same terms and conditions.*

6. The Hon'ble Single Bench of this Court in Crl.A.193/2020 titled as Harpreet Singh vs State vide order dated 01<sup>st</sup> July, 2020 sought clarification to the following effect:

“7. The queries that the Hon'ble Full Bench may consider and decide for the guidance of all concerned are as follows:

a. Whether the orders made by the Hon'ble Full Bench in W.P.(C) No. 3037/2020, including last order dated 15.06.2020, apply to all interim orders, whether made in civil or criminal matters, and regardless of whether such orders were made on or before 16.03.2020 or thereafter?

b. Whether interim bail or interim suspension of sentence has been granted by a Bench of this court exercising discretion and based upon specific facts and circumstances of a given case, would such orders also stand automatically extended by operation of orders made by the Full Bench in W.P.(C) No. 3037/2020?

8. While deciding the issue, the Hon'ble full Bench may consider the aspect of parity, namely that, on a plain reading of the orders in W.P.(C) No. 3037/2020, interim orders granted on or before 16.03.2020 appear to be getting extended by general directions; but those made after 16.03.2020 appear not to be covered thereby.”

7. In this regard, we make it clear that all the directions issued from time to time in this case are based on the ongoing pandemic situation in Delhi. So far as the criminal matters are concerned, these directions have been issued keeping in view the fact

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:36:10 +0530

*that the jail authorities have limited space to keep the inmates and in case of spread of Covid-19 pandemic in the jail, it would not be in a position to maintain physical distancing amongst jail inmates. Looking to this aspect and the possible threat of spreading of viral infection by those persons who are on interim bail/bail/parole granted by this court or the courts subordinate to this court, to other inmates of the jail on their return to the jail, the decision of extension of interim bail/bail/parole has been taken from time to time. It is clarified that this order of extension of bail/interim bail/parole shall be applicable to all undertrials/convicts, who are on bail/interim bail or parole as on date irrespective of the fact that they were released on bail/interim bail or parole before or after 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2020.*

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, SHO/IO and Ld. Defence Counsel through official email.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:36:16  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

**State Vs. Anil**

**FIR No: 72/2011**

**U/s 302/34 IPC**

**PS: Sadar Bazar**

**05.08.2020**

**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.**

**Ms. Dolly Nair, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.**

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

Ld. Counsel is seeking interim bail of accused Anil on the ground that the case of the accused is covered under the guidelines dated 31.07.2020 of High Powered Committee. During course of arguments, it is further submitted by Ld. Counsel that prosecution witnesses have not supported the version of the State and, therefore, accused deserves to be granted interim bail in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has argued for dismissal of present application on the ground that earlier application of accused (for grant of interim bail) has already been dismissed by this court vide order dated 10.07.2020 and there is no change of circumstance since passing of said order.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:34:58 +0530

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The earlier application for grant of interim bail, moved on behalf of applicant, has already been dismissed by this court vide order dated 10.07.2020 while dealing with all the contentions as raised with the following observations:

*“...As per report of jail superintendent the overall conduct of accused in jail is unsatisfactory as he has been awarded punishment for assaulting fellow inmates. Therefore, it is clear that accused has failed to fulfill the criteria as laid down by High Powered Committee vide minutes dated 18.05.2020.*

*The other reasons (for maintaining his ailing mother and unmarried sister) cited by accused for grant of interim bail does not disclose good grounds to be entertained as the very incarceration of an accused not only curtails his 'personal liberty' but also certain other rights like 'right to maintain and take care of one's family'. Even otherwise, the accused is in custody since June, 2011 therefore, it is evident that his family members are maintaining themselves at their own (since long) even in his absence.*

*The other argument, of false implication and eye witness not supporting the version of prosecution, is also not tenable in light of the fact that the matter is already at the final stage. Therefore, it would not be prudent to comment upon the probative value of testimony (recorded in the instant case ) by passing a mini judgment while considering the instant application...”*

Digitally  
signed by  
ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:35:05  
+0530

In the case of **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav and Another**, (2005) 2 SCC 42, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:

*"Ordinarily, the issues which had been canvassed earlier would not be permitted to be re-agitated on the same grounds, as the same it would lead to a speculation and uncertainty in the administration of justice and may lead to forum hunting."*

In the case of **State of Tamil Nadu vs S.A. Raja Appeal (crl.) 1470 of 2005** decided on 26 October, 2005, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:

*"Of course, the principles of res judicata are not applicable to bail applications, but the repeated filing of the bail applications without there being any change of circumstances would lead to bad precedents."*

In the case of **Harish Kathuria & Anr. Vs. State, Bail Application No. 1135/2011**, decided on 18.08.2011, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed as follows :

*"Successive bail applications can be filed as has been held in the catena of judgments but then it has been observed that there must be change in circumstances which warrant fresh consideration of the application. Successive bail applications without there being any change in circumstances is not only to be deprecated but is in effect a gross abuse of the processes of law which must be visited with some amount of sanction by way of cost for wasting the time of the Court. There are cases of persons who are*

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:35:28 +0530

*languishing in jail for wanting their appeals to be heard for want of time while as unscrupulous persons like the petitioners, who have embarked on a forum shopping or rather be called a bench hopping, are wasting the time of the Court."*

As there is no change in circumstances after dismissal of previous application for bail and, therefore, the instant application is also to meet the same fate. The case of accused is not covered under any guidelines laid down by High Powered Committee. In view of the aforesaid discussion, application for grant of interim bail moved on behalf of the applicant stands dismissed. Copy of the order be sent to concerned jail superintendent, IO/SHO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

Digitally  
signed by  
ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date  
2020.08.05  
14:35:36  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

**State Vs. Satender**

**FIR No: 293/20**

**U/s 399/402/411/120B/34 IPC and 25/54/59 Arms Act**

**PS: Burari**

**05.08.2020**

**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. Anwar A. Khan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.**

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

**Ld. APP for State has informed that the bail application of co-accused Ranjeet is fixed for hearing on 06.08.2020.**

**Let the present application of accused Satender be also listed on 06.08.2020.**

**ANUJ  
AGRAWAL**  
Digitally  
signed by  
ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:34:19  
+0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020**



**State Vs. Vikrant @ Bony**

**FIR No: 271/20**

**U/s 420/411/34 IPC**

**PS: Burari**

**05.08.2020**

**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. Kapil Jain, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.**

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

**Part arguments heard.**

**At request of Ld. APP, put up for remaining arguments on 13.08.2020. The copies of relevant CCTV footage shall be filed by State prior to next date of hearing.**

**ANUJ  
AGRAWAL**  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:32:52  
+0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020**

**State Vs. Ashu @ Gaurav**

**FIR No: 271/20**

**U/s 420/411/34 IPC**

**PS: Burari**

**05.08.2020**

**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. Kapil Jain, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.**

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

Part arguments heard.

At request of Ld. APP, put up for remaining arguments on 13.08.2020. The copies of relevant CCTV footage shall be filed by State prior to next date of hearing.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:33:07  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

**State Vs. Ravi Kumar @ Dedha**

**FIR No: 240/2020**

**U/s 308/325/342/392/34 IPC**

**PS: Wazirabad**

**05.08.2020**

**Through video conferencing**

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

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

**Sh. Nitin Arora, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.**

**Sh. Deepak Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the complainant.**

Fresh reply in terms of directions dated 30.07.2020 along with requisite record (including CCTV footage) filed by the 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 material contradiction in the version of complainant as he has firstly reported (in the PCR call) about forceful entry by 8-10 persons in his house whereas in the CCTV footage, filed today, only one person is seen entering into his house that too co-accused and not present applicant. It is further argued that the alleged injuries on the body of complainant are self inflicted and has not been caused by applicant/accused. It is argued that accused is in custody since 01.07.2020 and no more required for investigation.

**ANUJ  
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:33:28 +0530

**Page No. 1 of 4**

It is further argued that it was complainant who had initially misbehaved with female members of accused family and a cross FIR bearing No.284/2020 under Section: 354-A/354-B/509 IPC has already been registered against complainant at the instance of his wife. On these grounds, Ld. Counsel requests for grant of bail.

Per contra, Ld. APP for the State as well as Ld. Counsel for complainant have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that allegations against the accused/applicant are grave and serious. It is argued that accused alongwith other co-accused wrongfully confined the complainant, assaulted him and robbed him of Rs. 7,800/- when the complainant refused to sell his house to applicant/accused. It is argued that co-accused are yet to be arrested as they are absconding. It is further argued that the injuries suffered by complainant are not self inflicted and rather quite grave in nature and, therefore, FIR was inter-alia registered U/s 308 IPC. It is further argued that the false cross FIR was got registered by the applicant/accused as a counter blast to the present FIR.

I have heard the rival contentions and perused the record.

The allegations against the applicant/accused are grave and serious. IO has specifically reported that alleged incident was captured in CCTV footage and the co-accused are still absconding. It is reported that at the first instance, in the CCTV footage, co-accused Praveen @ Lallu Gurjar was seen entering into house of complainant forcefully and at second instance, co-accused Praveen @ Lallu Gurjar and Loki Gurjar, were seen manhandling and

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:33:41 +0530

threatening the complainant. The CCTV footage filed today confirms the said version of investigating officer. The contentions of defence regarding false implication or injuries being self inflicted can only be dealt during course of trial and not at this stage. The allegations against accused are quite grave and serious and the injuries, *prima facie*, do not appear to be self inflicted. The investigation is still at nascent stage and co-accused are yet to be arrested. Therefore, the possibility of accused tampering with evidence cannot be ruled out at this stage.

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”.*

Therefore, considering the totality of the circumstances , I am not inclined to grant bail to applicant/accused Ravi Kumar @ Dedha. Accordingly, the application seeking regular bail stands dismissed.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:33:49  
+0530

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:  
2020.08.05  
14:34:02  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

State Vs. Pramod

FIR No: 50/20

U/s 25/54/59 Arms Act

PS: Maurice Nagar

05.08.2020

Through video conferencing

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

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

Sh. Lokesh Kumar Garg, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Ld. Defence counsel has argued that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession or at the instance of the applicant. It is argued that the applicant is the sole bread earner of his family. It is further argued that the investigation has been completed and accused is not more required for investigation.

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has argued for dismissal of bail on the ground that allegations against accused are grave and serious as a country made pistol with two live cartridges was recovered from the possession of accused.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The case of the prosecution in nutshell is that the accused was found in possession of a country made pistol and two live cartridges on the

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:42:40 +0530

alleged date of incident. The accused is no more required for investigation as recovery has already been effected. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the current situation of pandemic, I am of the view, that no purpose would be served by keeping the accused behind bars. Accordingly, **accused/applicant Pramod @ Yash 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.** Application stands disposed of accordingly.

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

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:42:47 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020



**State Vs. Vikram Singh**

**FIR No: Not Known**

**PS: Subzi Mandi**

**05.08.2020**

**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. Khushant Wadhwa, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.**

**Reply not filed.**

**Ld. APP seeks some time to file reply.**

**At the request of Ld. APP, put up for filing of reply on 11.08.2020.**

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally  
signed by  
ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:34:36  
+0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)**  
**ASJ-03, Central District**  
**Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi**  
**05.08.2020**

SC No. 28537/2016

FIR No: 302/2015

PS: Kashmere Gate

State Vs. Raju

05.08.2020

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 Raju is on bail but not present.

Accused Ram Kumar not produced from JC.

The matter was lastly listed on 26.02.2020 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.

No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 21.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:26:44 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

SC No. 557/2018

FIR No: 194/2018

PS: Sarai Rohilla

State Vs. Irfan & ors

05.08.2020

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 Irfan not present. He is on interim bail vide order dated 18.05.2020.

Accused Ram Narain not produced from JC

Accused Naeem not present. He is on interim bail vide order dated 20.05.2020.

Accused Sheikh Shekhawat not present. He is already on bail prior to lockdown period.

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'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:26:56 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)

ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

SC No. 558/2018

FIR No: 121/2018

PS: Sarai Rohilla

State Vs. Irfaan & ors

05.08.2020

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 Irfan not present. He is on interim bail vide order dated 18.05.2020.

Accused Ram Narain not produced from JC

Accused Naeem not present. He is on interim bail vide order dated 20.05.2020.

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'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:27:08  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)

ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

CR No. 479/2019

Shashi Agarwal vs State & ors

05.08.2020

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 remaining respondents.

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 arguments on petition. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 22.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
ACRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:27:22 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

CR NO: 755/2019

Dalbir Singh Vohra & anr vs The State & Anr.

05.08.2020

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

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 further proceedings. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 20.10.2020.

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:27:44 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

SC No. 773/2019

Shakuntla vs State & anr

05.08.2020

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.

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 appearance of revisionist . No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 19.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:27:53 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

CR NO: 68/2020

Kuber Buildwell Ltd vs Registrar of Companies.

05.08.2020

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. Saurav Jain, Ld. Counsel for respondent ROC

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 service of respondent. Ld. Counsel for respondent has appeared today and seeks some time to file reply. Let the same be filed by next date of hearing with advance copy to other side. Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for further proceedings on 22.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:28:04  
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020



SC No. 27492/16  
FIR No: 494/2014  
PS: Subzi Mandi  
State Vs. Gaurav etc

05.08.2020

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 17.03.2020 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 19.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:28:14 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

SC No. 200//2017

FIR No: 258/2016

PS: Nabi Karim

State Vs. Sonu

05.08.2020

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 not present. He is on interim bail vide order dated 01.06.2020.

The matter was lastly listed on 15.02.2020 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 19.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.05  
14:28:22 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

M. CrI No. 69/2017

FIR No: 242/2015

PS: Karol Bagh

State Vs. Amit Kumar @ Toni

05.08.2020

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 not produced from JC

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 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 21.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:28:29 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020

SC No. 411/2017

FIR No: 45/2017

PS: Kashmere Gate

State Vs. Rajender Pal @ Sonu

05.08.2020

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 not present. He is on interim bail vide order dated 03.06.2020.

The matter was lastly listed on 15.02.2020 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 20.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.05  
14:28:36 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
05.08.2020