

SC No. 213/2018

FIR No: 03/18

PS: Kotwali

State Vs. Amit Kumar

06.08.2020

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 in view of current pandemic.

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

Accused Amit Kumar is on interim bail vide order dated 18.04.2020 but he is not present today.

The file has been placed today pursuant to directions dated 31.07.2020 passed by this court. Matter is at the stage of statement of accused U/s 313 Cr. P.C. However, he is not present today. Issue court notice to accused through concerned SHO/IO with direction to join the proceeding through VC. Notice be also issued to Ld. Defence Counsel for joining the proceedings through VC on next date of hearing. Copy of the order also sent to Ld. Defence Counsel.

Now to come up on 18.08.2020. The earlier date of 24.09.2020 (given due to *enblock* adjournments of the matter in terms of administrative directions of Hon'ble High Court) stands cancelled.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:03:22 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 27174/2016

FIR No: 295/2007

PS: Anand Parbat

State Vs. Fulena Yadav

06.08.2020

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

The matter was lastly listed on 22.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for final arguments. 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 23.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.06  
15:03:48 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 27525/2016

FIR No: 126/2011

PS: Nabi Karim

State Vs. Amit Kumar

06.08.2020

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 Amit and Sanjay are on bail prior to lockdown but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 08.01.2020 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 defence evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused also, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 21.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:03:16 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 27948/2016  
FIR No: 296/2007  
PS: Anand Parbat  
State Vs. Sanjay Kumar

06.08.2020

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

The matter was lastly listed on 22.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for defence evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused also, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 23.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:03:02 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 510/2017

FIR No: 118/2012

PS: Civil Lines

State Vs. Kishan @ Bishan & ors.

06.08.2020

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

Accused Kishan and Gautam not produced from judicial custody.

The matter was lastly listed on 27.02.2020 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 statement of accused U/s 313 of Cr. P.C. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic'. Since accused persons are not present, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:02:50 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)

ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 410/2017

FIR No: 46/2017

PS: Kashmere Gate

State Vs. Anil @ Pappu

06.08.2020

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 Anil @ Pappu is on interim bail vide order dated 03.06.2020 prior to lockdown period but not present today.

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

Previously, the matter was fixed for statement of accused U/s 313 of Cr. P.C. 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 15.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:02:43 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 472/2018

FIR No: 171/2017

PS: Lahori Gate

State Vs. Amjad

06.08.2020

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 Amjad not produced from judicial custody.

The matter was lastly listed on 17.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 26/DHC/2020 has been issued by Hon'ble High Court on 30.07.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 14.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for prosecution evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused also, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 22.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.06  
15:02:26 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 28037/2016

FIR No: 356/2015

PS: Rajinder Nagar

State Vs. Lallu Ram

06.08.2020

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 Lallu Ram and Paragi Lal are on interim bail vide order dated 10.06.2020 but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 17.02.2020 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 prosecution evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused also, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 23.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:02:18 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020



SC No. 28197/2016

FIR No: 170/2015

PS: I.P.Estate

State Vs. Danish & ors.

06.08.2020

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 Danish not produced from judicial custody.

Accused Shahwaj @ Musa and Farman are on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 12.03.2020 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 prosecution evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused also, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 20.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:01:22 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

CR No. 126/2020

Rahul Vs. Babli & ors.

06.08.2020

Through video conferencing

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

Present: None.

The matter was lastly listed on 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 maintainability of revision 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 revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 21.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:01:50 +0530

CA No. 466/2019

Anis Ahmed Vs. Ayesha & anr.

06.08.2020

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. 2.

The matter was lastly listed on 25.11.2019 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 settlement between parties. 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 appellant and respondent no. 1, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 22.10.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
15:00:54 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 201/2017

FIR No: 135/2016

PS: Jama Masjid

State Vs. Mohd. Azam

06.08.2020

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 Azam on interim bail vide order dated 29.05.2020 but he is not present today.

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

Previously, the matter was fixed for prosecution evidence/production of accused. 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: 2020.08.06  
15:01:11 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

SC No. 28663/2016

FIR No: 141/13

PS: Sarai Rohilla

State Vs. Kuldeep

06.08.2020

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 Kuldeep was on bail prior to lockdown period but not present today.

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 presence of IO. 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: 2020.08.06  
15:00:46 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

State Vs. Ranjeet

FIR No: 293/20

Under Section: 399/402/411/120B/34 IPC and 25/54/59 Arms Act

PS: Burari

06.08.2020

Through video conferencing

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

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

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

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case as he has been arrested on the disclosure statement of other co-accused persons. It is further argued that there is no admissible evidence against applicant/accused. It is argued that accused is no more required for the purpose of investigation and therefore, may be granted bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Ld. APP for the state submits that replies filed (previously as well as today) are vague and IO did not provide the requisite clarifications to him despite his request. It is further submitted by Ld. APP that on the basis of material available on record including the replies filed by IO, a case under Section 120- B and 408 r/w 120-B IPC is only made out against applicant/accused for conspiring with co-accused to misappropriate the cash amount of his employer by planning a fake robbery. On query, Ld. APP for State submits that employer is yet to join the investigation.

I have heard the rival contentions and perused the record.

The reply filed by IO is vague and evasive. There is nothing in the reply of IO to suggest if any complaint regarding alleged misappropriation has been made by employer of accused Ranjeet. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of present case and in view of submissions of Ld. APP, I am of the view that accused Ranjeet deserves to be granted bail in

contd..2/-

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:01:41 +0530

State Vs. Ranjeet

FIR No: 293/20

Under Section: 399/402/411/120B/34 IPC and 25/54/59 Arms Act

PS: Burari

the instant case. Accordingly, accused/applicant Ranjeet 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.

Since it is evident that requisite assistance was not provided to Ld. APP by concerned Investigating Officer/SHO, I deem it fit that the matter be brought to the notice of worthy DCP with a request to look into the matter and take appropriate remedial action.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/DCP (Central)/concerned jail superintendent and Ld. Defence counsel through e-mail.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:01:49 +0530

State Vs. Arjun Tewatia

FIR No: 120/20

Under Section: 354/354A/506/34 IPC

PS: Burari

06.08.2020

Through video conferencing

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

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Abhishek Ranjan, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.  
SHO,PS Burari through VC.

Reply by IO filed. Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is stated that complainant being sister-in-law (Bhabhi) has filed false complaint against him and his other family members because of family disputes. It is stated that accused/applicant has clean antecedents and therefore, deserves to be granted bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

On query, Ld. APP for State as well as concerned SHO submits that the allegations against accused/applicant, at present, are only U/s 506(ii) IPC.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The present FIR has been registered on the complaint of prosecutrix alleging that her father-in-law i.e. co-accused Bashant Tewatiya, had outraged her modesty by touching her private parts. It is further alleged that the present applicant Arjun and other co-accused namely Harender Tewatiya had threatened to kill her on

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:00:13 +0530

contd..2/-



State Vs. Arjun Tewatia

FIR No: 120/20

Under Section: 354/354A/506/34 IPC

PS: Burari

13.03.2020. It is evident from the FIR that only allegations against the accused/applicant are under Section 506(ii) IPC only which is bailable in nature. Therefore, there is no apprehension much less reasonable apprehension that accused/applicant may be arrested in a non-bailable case. Therefore, the instant application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed being non maintainable.

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:  
2020.08.06  
17:00:20 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

State Vs. Faisal @ Umar Chaudhary

FIR No: 0287/2020

Under Section: 376/506 IPC

PS: Wazirabad

06.08.2020

Through video conferencing

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

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

Reply by IO filed. Copy of same supplied to other side electronically. Concerned SHO/IO shall verify whether the record of various Whatsapp chat, as annexed with present application, pertain to prosecutrix and accused or not. It shall further be verified if the mobile numbers as shown in the said record belong/used or being used by prosecutrix and accused. SHO/IO shall also join the proceedings through VC on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on 07.08.2020.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:00:40 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

State Vs. Shivam @ Shibhu

FIR No: 132/2020

Under Section: 188/392/397/411 IPC

PS: Subzi Mandi

06.08.2020

Through video conferencing

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

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Ms Neetu Singh, Ld. Legal Aid Counsel for the applicant/accused.

Reply by IO has been filed. Copy has already been supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Legal Aid Counsel submits that applicant/accused is seeking bail on the ground of current Pandemic Situation. It is argued that accused has been falsely implicated and he has nothing to do with the instant case. It is further argued that chargesheet has already been filed and therefore, accused is no more required for investigation. On these grounds, Ld. Legal Aid Counsel seeks grant of bail to accused.

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the allegations against the accused/applicant are grave and serious and accused/applicant may threaten the witnesses, if enlarged on bail.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

In brief, the case of prosecution is that on 19.04.2020 at about 03:30 PM, applicant/accused alongwith other co-accused robbed the complainant of his mobile phone and cash of Rs. 8,200/-. The accused was arrested at the instance of complainant and robbed mobile phone was also recovered from his possession. The allegations against the

contd..2/-

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:11:31 +0530

State Vs. Shivam @ Shibhu

FIR No: 132/2020

Under Section: 188/392/397/411 IPC

PS: Subzi Mandi

accused are grave and serious. IO has reported involvement of accused in as many as three other cases of similar nature apart from present case. Therefore, the possibility of accused, committing the offences of similar nature, if enlarged on bail, cannot be ruled out. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, I am not inclined to grant bail to accused/applicant. Accordingly, bail application of accused/applicant Shivam @ Shibhu is hereby dismissed.

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

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:11:38 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

State Vs. Harpreet Singh

FIR No: 143/2013

Under Section: 364-A/342/323/120-B/34 IPC

PS: Rajinder Nagar

06.08.2020

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.

This is an application filed on behalf of accused/applicant for preponement of date of hearing of final arguments.

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

Ld. Counsel for applicant submits that matter is at the stage of final arguments and same is listed on 13.10.2020. It is further argued that next date of hearing may be preponed and final arguments be heard through video conferencing.

On the other hand, Ld. APP for State submits that matter is quite grave in nature and the evidence and record of the instant case is quite voluminous and, therefore, final arguments cannot be addressed through video conferencing. It is further argued by Ld. APP that the final arguments shall address physically once the normal functioning of the court resumes.

In view of submissions of both parties, I am of the view that Parties (whether State or defence) cannot be compelled to address final arguments through VC, more so, when the record is voluminous. Hence, the present application seeking preponment stands dismissed.

Put up on the date already fixed i.e. 13.10.2020.

However, I may clarify that in case physical functioning of District Courts resumes prior to 13.10.2020, the parties would be at liberty to make a request for preponment of the matter.

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

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:01:01 +0530

State Vs. Satender

FIR No: 293/20

Under Section: 399/402/411/120B/34 IPC and 25/54/59 Arms Act

PS: Burari

06.08.2020

Through video conferencing

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

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Anwar A.Khan, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

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

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case as he has been arrested on the disclosure statement of other co-accused persons. It is further argued that there is no admissible evidence against applicant/accused. It is argued that accused is no more required for the purpose of investigation and therefore, may be granted bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Ld. APP for the state submits that replies filed (previously as well as today) are vague and IO did not provide the requisite clarifications to him despite his request. It is further submitted by Ld. APP that despite his specific request, IO has not provided him a copy of disclosure statement of applicant. It is submitted that on the basis of material available on record including the replies filed by IO, it appears that a case under Section 399/402/120-B IPC is made out against applicant/accused as he along with co-accused Deepak and Amit and two other CCLs (Child in Conflict with Law) were planning to commit a dacoity.

I have heard the rival contentions and perused the record.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by  
ANUJ AGRAWAL  
Date: 2020.08.06  
17:11:01 +0530

Contd..2/-

State Vs. Satender

FIR No: 293/20

Under Section: 399/402/411/120B/34 IPC and 25/54/59 Arms Act

PS: Burari

Despite repeated efforts of court official, IO did not join the VC proceedings, being incommunicable. Evidently, the reply filed by IO is vague and evasive. The allegations against accused Satender appear to be general and vague. No specific allegations (against applicant) and the evidence in support of same, have been pointed out by IO in his reply. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of present case, I am of the view that accused Satender deserves to be granted bail. Accordingly, accused/applicant Satender 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.

Since it is evident that requisite assistance was not provided to Ld. APP by concerned Investigating Officer/SHO, I deem it fit that the matter be brought to the notice of worthy DCP with a request to look into the matter and take appropriate remedial action.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/DCP (Central)/concerned jail superintendent and Ld. Defence counsel through e-mail.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.06  
17:11:08 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020

State Vs. Santosh Gupta

FIR No: 160/13

Under Section: 365/302/120B IPC

PS: NDRS

06.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.  
None for applicant.

As none is present on behalf of applicant/accused, present application is dismissed in default. Application stands disposed of accordingly.

ANUJ  
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed  
by ANUJ  
AGRAWAL  
Date:  
2020.08.06  
17:02:16 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)  
ASJ-03, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
06.08.2020