

19.08.2020

File taken up today in terms of order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15/08/2020 r/w other orders received from time to time.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

Fresh Criminal Revision petition received in physical form as well as by electronic mode. It be checked and registered accordingly.

Present: Sh. Sunny, Ld. Counsel for revisionist.

The order under challenge is regarding summoning of 17.11.2018. It is stated by learned counsel for revisionist Sh. Sunny that revisionist came to know about the present order recently only on 13.03.2020. But due to lock-down, he could not file this revision petition so far.

Heard. Under these circumstances before proceeding further on merit, let notice be issued to all the respondents through electronic mode as per the directions received from higher authority **regarding limitation aspect only.**

Further, trial court record be also summoned for next date of hearing.

Put up on 31.08.2020.

Steps be taken by revisionist within three days ,inter alia, including regarding placing on record E-mail ID and Mobile number of all the respondents.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020

: 1 :

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

**State Vs. Taufique @ Kala
(INTERIM BAIL OF TAUFIQUE @ KALA)
FIR No. : 20/2016
PS: Crime Branch
U/S: 364A, 395,342,420,471,120B, 34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
through VC
Sh. ACP Gautam, Ld. Counsel for accused/
applicant Sunny through VC.

Today, matter was fixed for orders.

1. *Observations given by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 2945/2020 dated 23.03.2020 in case titled as "Shobha Gupta and Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.", Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Suo Moto W.P.(C) No. 1/2020 dated 23.03.2020 and Revised Advisory Protocol dated 30.03.2020 have been issued by Ld. District & Sessions Judge (HQ) read with other directions received from time to time including on 28.03.2020, 07.04.2020, 18.04.2020, 05.05.2020, 18.05.2020 and 20.06.2020 from Hon'ble High Court as a result of various meetings of Delhi State Legal Services Authority, present application is taken up.*

2. Vide present order, Interim bail application of accused/applicant Taufiq @ Kala dated 05.08.2020 is disposed of.

3. Reply already filed by IO.

4. Arguments heard.

5. In nutshell, it is stated and argued on behalf of accused that accused is in JC since August, 2016 and case at the stage of PE; that PW-5 is already hostile; that co-accused is

: 2 :

granted bail by Hon'ble High Court; that no interim bail application was moved during lock-down; that at the time of arrest, his wife was pregnant and now she has delivered a male child; that his family is in financial problem and there is no one look after them; no purpose would be served to keep the accused in JC; there is spread of corona virus; that there is no tenable evidence against the accused. As such, it is prayed that he be granted interim bail for sixty days.

6. On the other hand, in reply filed by the IO such bail application is opposed. It is stated that he is involved in other criminal matters. It is argued by learned Addl. PP for the state that present offence is very serious in nature and offences charged against the accused are punishable upto imprisonment for life. As such, present bail application is strongly opposed.

7. For the present type of offences, a relaxed criteria for interim bail is recommended by Hon'ble High Court dated 18/04/2020, but it was inter-alia subject to that accused is suffering from HIV,cancer, chronic kidney dysfunction (requiring dialysis) , Hepatitis B or C, Ashtma and T.B.

It is not the case of the accused that he is suffering from any of such disease. As such, the case of the present accused does not fall under the relaxed criteria given by the Hon'ble High Court.

8. Even otherwise, it is not the case that he is or anybody in his barrack is suffering from corona virus. Further, offence is very serious in nature. Further, such accused is involved in other criminal cases as reported by the IO. Further, all material witnesses are yet not examined. As such, this court is not inclined to grant interim bail to the present accused. With these observations, present interim bail application is dismissed.

9. ***With these observations present bail application is***

: 3 :

disposed of as dismissed. Learned counsel for the applicant / accused is at liberty to collect the order through electronic mode. Copy of this order be sent to SHO / IO concerned. Copy of order be uploaded on the website. Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/THC
19.08.2020.

: 1 :

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

**State Vs. Taufique @ Kala
(INTERIM BAIL OF SUNNY)
FIR No. : 20/2016
PS: Crime Branch
U/S: 364A, 395,342,420,471,120B, 34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
through VC
Sh. ACP Gautam, Ld. Counsel for accused/
applicant Sunny through VC.

Today, matter was fixed for orders.

1. *Observations given by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 2945/2020 dated 23.03.2020 in case titled as "Shobha Gupta and Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.", Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Suo Moto W.P.(C) No. 1/2020 dated 23.03.2020 and Revised Advisory Protocol dated 30.03.2020 have been issued by Ld. District & Sessions Judge (HQ) read with other directions received from time to time including on 28.03.2020, 07.04.2020, 18.04.2020, 05.05.2020, 18.05.2020 and 20.06.2020 from Hon'ble High Court as a result of various meetings of Delhi State Legal Services Authority, present application is taken up.*

2. Vide present order, Interim bail application of accused/applicant Sunny dated 28.05.2020 is disposed of.

3. Reply already filed by IO .

4. Arguments heard.

5. In nutshell, it is stated and argued on behalf of accused that accused is in JC for about four years and case at the stage of PE; no purpose would be served to keep the accused in JC; there is spread of corona virus; that there is no tenable evidence against the accused and he is suffering from throat

: 2 :

disease which is harmful for his life and he is not given proper treatment by the jail authority. As such, it is prayed that he be granted interim bail for sixty days.

6. On the other hand, in reply dated 29.07.2020, such bail application is opposed. It is stated that he is involved in four other criminal matters. It is argued by learned Addl. PP for the state that present offence is very serious in nature and offences charged against the accused are punishable upto imprisonment for life. It is further pointed out that his interim bail application on similar ground is already rejected by reasoned order vide order dated 30.06.2020. As such, present bail application is strongly opposed.

7. Further, medical status report is filed by Jail Superintendent.

8. For the present type of offences, a relaxed criteria for interim bail is recommended by Hon'ble High Court dated 18/04/2020, but it was inter-alia subject to that accused is suffering from HIV, cancer, chronic kidney dysfunction (requiring dialysis), Hepatitis B or C, Ashtma and T.B.

It is not the case of the accused that he is suffering from any of such disease. As such, the case of the present accused does not fall under the relaxed criteria given by the Hon'ble High Court.

9. Even otherwise, all such grounds raised in the present application are already raised, discussed and previous bail order dated 30.06.2020 which bail application was filed through present advocate only. In view of the reasons already given, interim bail application dated 30.06.2020 and there is no material change in circumstances, this court do not find the ground on merit stated by the accused sufficient to admit him to interim bail. Further, it is not the case that he is or anybody in his barrack is suffering from

: 3 :

corona virus. Further, offence is very serious in nature. As such, this court is not inclined to grant interim bail to the present accused. With these observations, present interim bail application is dismissed.

10. ***With these observations present bail application is disposed of as dismissed. Learned counsel for the applicant / accused is at liberty to collect the order through electronic mode. Copy of this order be sent to SHO / IO concerned. Copy of order be uploaded on the website. Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned.***

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/THC
19.08.2020.**

CA 457/2019

Manjeet Singh Vs M/s Pooja Finlease Ltd.

File taken up today in terms of order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15/08/2020 r/w other orderS received from time to time.

In view of the above-mentioned orders/directions, file is taken up through Webex.

In the present case, last regular date of hearing was 25/04/2020 & 18/06/2020.

On 18/06/2020, matter was adjourned for 19/08/2020.

Thereafter, as per directions from Hon'ble High Court, matter was adjourned was far due to lock-down.

But in view of latest directions, matter is taken up today for hearing today through VC.

The undersigned is also looking after the work of Learned Link ASJ-03 Mr. Anuj Aggarwal.

Dated :19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Ravinder, proxy counsel for appellant.

None for respondent.

At request, put up for compliance of the previous order afresh for 16/10/2020.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)

ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020

CC No.: 24/2017
Case No.: ECIR/11/DLZO/2016
Enforcement Directorate Vs. Vineet Gupta & Others

19.08.2020.

The undersigned is also looking after the work of Learned Link court ASJ-03 Mr. Anuj Aggarwal.

Present: Mr. Atul Kumar Tripathi, learned Special PP for ED through V.

Mr. Gaurav Gupta and Mr. Swastik Dalai, learned counsel for accused No.11 Nitin Gupta through VC.

Mr. Madhav Khurana, learned counsel for accused No.13 Shashank Jain through VC.

Mr. R.K.Thakur, Mr. Ruchit Dugar and Mr. Shiv Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for accused No.14 Anirudh Aggarwal through VC.

Mr. Shashank Singh and Mr. Arjun Minocha, learned counsel for accused Nos. 16 to 19 through VC.

Mr. Kunal Prakash Jain, learned counsel for accused No.20 ,Kanav Gupt through VC .

None for remain accused .

1. No reason is given for non appearance of such remaining accused persons. Still taking a lenient view ,no coercive action taken against them at present.

2. Further it is stated that although the matter was pending for arguments on charge, but certain copies in proper format/electronic mode of CCTV footage is not yet supplied.

3. Learned counsel for ED seeks sometime to take further strps and file report regarding same from forensic laboratory by NDOH.

4. It is further stated that there is an application u/s 91 Cr.PC pending. Put up for arguments on the same also on the next

date of hearing. In case ED wants to any formal reply, the same be filed in electronic mode with advance copy to the concerned advocate / accused.

5. Put up for appropriate proceedings, arguments for **18/09/2020**.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/THC
19.08.2020

: 1 :

CC No.: 24/17
Enforcement Directorate v. Vineet Gupta

Dated:19.08.2020

Present: Sh. Atul Tripathi, Ld. Special PP for ED through VC.
Ld. Counsel for Applicant/ accused no.14 Anirudh Agarwal through VC.

1. Vide this order, the application dated 23.07.2020 filed by accused no.14/Anirudh Agarwal for release of passport.

2. It is submitted in nutshell, in such application that he is having passport bearing no. J 6748699 issued on 20.05.2011 valid upto 19.05.2021 from Ghaziabad. It is further stated that same is in possession of this court. That at the time of granting bail by the learned Predecessor of this court on 05.12.2019, one of the condition imposed was that the accused shall deposit his passport. Accordingly, such passport was deposited in court earlier. That accused is in urgent need of passport as the renewal of his son's(minor) passport is due as same is expiring on 19.01.2021. Further, passport is urgently required by his son as he has to go abroad for study. As such, it is prayed the same be released at the earliest.

3. No reply is filed by Enforcement Directorate. But it is argued by learned Special PP for ED that there is no urgency in moving the present application. It is further submitted that due to lock-down, there is no possibility to travel outside India. As such, present application is opposed.

4. I have heard both the sides and gone through the

record.

5. From the material on record, it is clear that in the present case, no steps has been taken so far by ED under Section 10 of the Passport Act which provides for variation, impounding and revocation of the passports and travel documents. Section 10A of the Act which provides for an order to suspend with immediate effect any passport or travel document; such other appropriate order which may have the effect of rendering any passport or travel document invalid, for a period not exceeding four weeks, if the Central Government or any designated officer on its satisfaction holds that it is necessary in public interest to do without prejudice to the generality of the provisions contained in Section 10 by approaching the Central Government or any designated officer. Therefore, it appears that the passport of the applicant could not have been impounded except by the Passport Authority in accordance with law. Further, it appears that order to retain the passports as the main condition has not been done in conformity with the provisions of law as there is no order of the passport authorities under Section 10(3)(e) or by the Central Government or any designated officer under Section 10A of the Act to impound the passport.

6. Further, the judgment of **Suresh Nanda v. CBI** (decided on 24.01.2008, in an appeal(Crl.) 179/2008 arising out of SLP(Crl.) 3408/2007), it is held that Section 104 of Cr.P.C. is a general provision whereas Section 10 and 10A of Passport Act, is specific provisions and thus over rides the general provisions of Cr.P.C. Further, it was stated that seizing a document is different from impounding the same. It

was further held that impounding of passport by CBI is not in conformity with the provisions of law as there is no order of passport authority U/s 10(3)(e) or of Central Government or any other designated authority u/s 10A of Passport Act. ***In fact it was further held that even the court cannot impound the passport.*** It was further held that it shall be open to the concerned prosecuting agency to approach the Passport Authorities U/s 10 of the authority u/s 10A for impounding the passport of the appellant in accordance with law.

7. Therefore, having regard to such position of law as stated by Hon'ble Supreme Court above including that personal liberty within the meaning of Article 21 includes within its ambit the right to go abroad, even though the "further investigation" is still pending, this court is not the competent authority to impose condition on the passport of the applicant as per the provision of law, including under Passport Act.

8. As such passport bearing no. J 6748699 is directed to be released/given back to the applicant/accused within two weeks. **But in such facts and circumstances of present case the ED is given liberty to approach the appropriate authority within two weeks from today, for impounding the passport, if so desired by ED, in accordance with law.** Further, Enforcement Directorate is at liberty to open Look Out Circular(LOC), against present accused, if so desired by it in its own wisdom, as passport is now ordered to be released.

9. Further, needless to say that applicant is duty bound to produce such passport as and when required by the

: 4 :

investigating agency/ED or by this court. It is further made clear that release of such passport do not amount in any way granting permission to leave India without seeking prior permission from the court.

10. Application stands disposed of accordingly.
11. Copy of this order be given to counsels for both the parties through electronic mode.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/THC
19.08.2020

BAIL APPLICATION

**State v. Abdul Salam
(INTERIM BAIL OF ADNAN HUSSAIN)
FIR No. 02/2014
PS: Jama Masjid
U/S: 302,394,411,34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Md. Jamal Khan, Learned counsel on behalf of Sh. Asghar Khan,
learned counsel for the applicant / accused through VC.

This application is dated 04.04.2020 and is pending for regular bail or in alternative for the interim bail as per prayer made in such application.

It is stated that main counsel is busy in video conferencing before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

As such, at request, put up for further appropriate proceedings for date already fixed in the regular matter.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

BAIL APPLICATION

**State v. Ankit etc.
(INTERIM BAIL OF GAUTAM)
FIR No. 70/2019
PS: Sarai Rohilla *Railway Station*
U/S: 302,34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. Hari Kishan, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

Matter is passed over for supplying copy of reply, if any already
received.

Put up at 12 noon.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

At 12 Noon.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. Hari Kishan, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

Copy of reply supplied.

IO has sought time to verify certain documents.

As such, put up for further reply of the IO. Issue notice to IO accordingly.

Put up for further reply, arguments and appropriate orders on

24.08.2020.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

Application for Extension of Interim Bail

**FIR No. : 34/2014
PS:Prashad Nagar
STATE v. Deepak Kumar
U/S: 302, 394, 411 IPC**

19.08.2020.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar,Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. Yogesh Swaroop, learned counsel for the applicant through VC.

1. Vide this order, application filed by accused through counsel for extension of interim bail is disposed off.

2. It is stated that earlier he was granted interim bail vide order dated 23/06/2020 for 45 days by this court. Now, it is prayed that there is another order dated 13.07.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court and in view of the same, interim bail of the accused be extended further.

3. Reply filed by the IO through electronic mode. Copy supplied to accused side.

4. Arguments heard from both the sides and I have gone through the record including original order for interim bail order dated 23.06.2020.

5. At this stage it may be noted that Full bench of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in its order dated 13/07/2020 in W.P.(C) 3037/2020 titled as "Court on its own motion v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Anr. Held as under :

".....5. In view of the above, we hereby further extend the

FIR No. : 34/2014
PS:Prashad Nagar
STATE v. Deepak Kumar
U/S: 302, 394, 411 IPC

implementation of the directions contained in our order dated 25th March, 2020 and 15th May, 2020 and 15th June, 2020, till 31st August, 2020 with the same terms and conditions.

6. The Hon'ble Single Bench of this Court in CrI.A.193/2020 titled as Harpreet Singh vs. State vide order dated 1st 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. Where 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 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 16th March, 2020.*

.
.

9. List this matter on 24th August, 2020 for further

directions.”.

6. In the reply, it is stated by the IO that the accused did not comply additional bail conditions imposed by this court while granting interim bail in question. On the other hand, it is stated by learned counsel for the accused that there was bonafide mistake on the part of the accused and instead of police station of the present case, he went to the police station of his area where he is residing and met police officer over there.

In any case, in view of such order and clarification dated 13.07.2020 by Hon'ble High Court, there is no need to pass any specific order in the present application and interim bail stands extended till 31/08/2020. Present application is disposed off accordingly.

7. Both sides are at liberty to collect the order through electronic mode. **A copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned. Further a copy of this order be given to IO through electronic mode.**

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/THC
19.08.2020

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

**State v. Rahul Sharma
(INTERIM BAIL OF NOORI)
FIR No. 339/2016
PS: Daryaganj
U/S: 395,397,412,120B,34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. J.S. Mishra, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

Issue notice of the present application to IO for filing reply.

Put up for reply, arguments and appropriate orders on 26.08.2020.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

BAIL APPLICATION

**State v. Raj Bahadur
(INTERIM BAIL OF VASUDEV)
FIR No. 130/2014
PS: Kamla Market
U/S: 395,392,412,120B IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. Rajan Bhatia, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

This is an application filed through Jail Superintendent.

Counsel for applicant submits that he does not have instructions as far as present application is concerned. It is further stated that wife of accused/applicant states that there are certain orders passed by Hon'ble High Court regarding interim bail of such accused. As such, Ahlmad of the court to report regarding bail if any received from Hon'ble High Court.

Matter is passed over accordingly.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

AT 2.20 pm

It is reported by the Ahlmad of this court that vide order dated 28.07.2020, such accused is already granted interim bail by Hon'ble High court. As such, present interim bail application moved through Jail Superintendent has become infructuous. Same is disposed of accordingly.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

**State v.Sunil
(INTERIM BAIL OF SONU)
FIR No. 415/2015
PS: Kotwali
U/S: 395,397,365,412,120B,34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. Uma Shanker Gautam, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

This is an application for interim bail.

**Put up for reply, arguments and appropriate orders for 27.08.2020
including regarding health condition of the mother of the accused.**

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

**State v. Sunil @ Ajay
(INTERIM BAIL OF SUNIL @ AJAY)
FIR No. 107/2020
PS: NABI KARIM
U/S: 394,397,34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. P.K. Garg, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

Issue notice of the present application to IO for filing reply.

Put up for reply, arguments and appropriate orders on 26.08.2020.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

**State v. Tehsin @ Kevda
(INTERIM BAIL OF ANIS @ DUPATEWALA)
FIR No. 20/2015
PS: Kamla Market
U/S: 302,396,397,412,120B,34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. J.S. Mishra, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

Issue notice of the present application to IO for filing reply.

Further, issue notice to Jail Superintendent concerned for filing medical
status report regarding this accused Anis @ Dupatewala.

Put up on 26.08.2020.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

**State v. Tehsin @ Kevda
(INTERIM BAIL OF ANIS @ DUPATEWALA)
FIR No. 20/2015
PS: Kamla Market
U/S: 302,396,397,412,120B,34 IPC**

19.08.2020

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. J.S. Mishra, Learned counsel for the applicant / accused
through VC.

Issue notice of the present application to IO for filing reply.

Further, issue notice to Jail Superintendent concerned for filing medical
status report regarding this accused Anis @ Dupatewala.

Put up on 26.08.2020.

**(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)
ASJ-04/Central/19.08.2020**

INTERIM BAIL APPLICATION

State Vs. Ashu @ Atta

FIR No.: 210/2018

PS: Prasad Nagar

U/S: 302, 34 IPC & 25, 27, 54, 59 Arms Act

19.08.2020.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. Vineet Jain, learned counsel for the applicant through VC.

Reply dated 13/08/2020 filed by the IO. But it is stated by both the sides that it does not contain the reply to the present application.

Heard. As such, IO is directed to file pointwise reply to the present interim bail application also regarding condition of the mother as well as minor daughter of the accused by the next date of hearing.

Put up for reply, arguments and appropriate order for **22/08/2020.**

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)

ASJ-04/Central/THC

Central District/19.08.2020

MISC APPLICATION

State Vs. Rahul Sharma

FIR No.: 339/016

PS: Darya Ganj

19.08.2020.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Mr. Akhilesh Kamle, learned counsel for applicant / accused.

An application for release of vehicle and mobile phone has been filed. It be checked and registered separately.

Part arguments heard.

It appears that such vehicle application was moved earlier also and the same was already rejected by my learned predecessor. As such, further it appears that such order was never challenged in any higher courts.

Under these circumstances, put up for regular date of hearing for further arguments and disposal of this application. Put up for the date already fixed.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)

ASJ-04/Central/THC

Central District/19.08.2020

BAIL APPLICATION

State Vs. Ram Nawal @ Parsuram

FIR No.: 327/2016

PS: Roop Nagar

U/S: 302 IPC

19.08.2020.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl. PP for the State
through VC.
Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh, learned counsel for accused
through VC.

Fresh application seeking regular bail on behalf of
applicant / accused Ram Nawal @ Parsuram filed through counsel.
It be checked and registered separately.

Issue notice to IO to file reply including regarding
previous regular bail, if any, filed by the accused by the next date of
hearing.

Put up for reply, arguments and appropriate order for
26/08/2020.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)

ASJ-04/Central/THC

Central District/19.08.2020

BAIL APPLICATION

State Vs. Shankar Kumar Jha @ Moment @ Vikash

FIR No.: 14/2019

PS: Subzi Mandi Railway Station

U/S: 394, 411, 34 IPC

19.08.2020.

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Addl. PP for the State
through VC.

Mr. S.N. Shukla, learned LAC for applicant / accused
through VC.

Fresh application seeking regular bail on behalf of
applicant / accused Shankar Kumar Jha filed through counsel. It
be checked and registered separately.

Issue notice to IO to file reply by the next date of
hearing.

Put up for reply by the IO, arguments and appropriate
order for **26/08/2020**.

Further report be called from the Jail Superintendent
concerned regarding health status of such accused for the last six
months on the next date of hearing.

(Naveen Kumar Kashyap)

ASJ-04/Central/THC

Central District/19.08.2020