

Bail Application No.2447/21
FIR No. 174/21
P.S. Gulabi Bagh
U/s 392/397/411/120B/34 IPC
State Vs. Prabjot @ Sahib

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

This is an application moved for accused/applicant Prabjot @ Sahib under Section 439 Cr.P.C., for grant of bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Nitin Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the accused seeks adjournment for arguments. At request, list for arguments on 01.10.2021.

Copy of this order be uploaded on the website.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2443/21

FIR No. 416/2021

U/s 498A/406/34 IPC

P.S. Wazirabad

State Vs. Dayawati

23.07.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been filed on behalf of accused Dayawati for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.

Sh. Vijender Singh Dhangar, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Report of IO received.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.
2. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submitted that applicant is the mother in law of complainant, and she is a senior citizen. Ld. Counsel has vehemently contended that the present issue is a matrimonial dispute between the son of the accused herein and the complainant,

and that marriage solemnized without her consent. Ld. Counsel has further submitted that husband of the complainant has already been granted anticipatory bail. Thus, applicant ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld. Addl. PP for the State alongwith IO vehemently opposed the present anticipatory bail application as per law.
4. Before advertng to the rival contentions of the parties, the facts of the present case, as alleged by the prosecution, are hereby succinctly recapitulated: It is alleged by the complainant that the she got married to the applicant on 29.01.2020. After some time of marriage the applicant and his family started demanding money and other items from the complainant. Complainant stated that she was not only beaten, harassed and tortured but also was abused physically and sexually by her husband.
5. In matters pertaining to matrimonial dispute, it would be apposite to refer to the following extract of ***Udit Raj Poonia Vs. State (Government of NCT of Delhi) 2017 (1) DLT (Cri) 805 :-***

“23. This Court is of the considered opinion that in matters of matrimonial cases, the Investigating Officer is required to first make out whether any article is to be recovered. In case, he is of the view that any article is to be recovered then he is to decide whether the custodial interrogation of any of the accused is required for the purpose of recovery of article. Without reaching to the conclusion with regard to recovery of article, whether it is stridhan article or any other article, the Investigating Officer is not to arrest the person for the recovery of the same.

24. Similarly, the bail application ought not be rejected for setting the scores between the parties.

25. As per the discussions made above, this Court view that :
*Provisions of Section 41 Cr.P.C. and the guidelines issued vide Standing Order Nos. 330/2008 and 444/2016 are mandatory in nature and must be complied with
*The DCP/ACP shall ensure that the alleged articles are in existence and the recovery/seizure could take place without the arrest, in other words, that arrest is the only mode in the facts and circumstances to effect the recovery before granting the sanction to arrest.
*Similarly, the Court while considering the bail under Section 437, 438,439 Cr.P.C. shall refused the bail in exceptional circumstances.
* The exceptional circumstances may be assessed by the court concerned and the bail application must be decided expeditiously.
*In the matrimonial cases bail is a rule and refusal is an exception.”

6. Regarding the issue of cooperation with the investigating agencies, it would be apposite to reproduce the following extracts of **Bhadresh Bipin Bhai Sheth Vs. State of Gujarat & Anr., (2016) 1 Supreme Court Cases 152:-**

7. “The principles for grant of anticipatory bail can be summarised as follows:-

(i).....

(ii).....

(iii) It is imperative for the courts to carefully and with meticulous precision evaluate the facts of the case. The discretion to grant bail must be exercised on the basis of the available material and the facts of the particular case. **In cases where the court is of the considered view that the accused has joined the investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigating agency and is not**

likely to abscond, in that event, custodial interrogation should be avoided. A great ignominy, humiliation and disgrace is attached to arrest. Arrest leads to many serious consequences not only for the accused but for the entire family and at times for the entire community. Most people do not make any distinction between arrest at a pre-conviction stage or post-conviction stage.....”

8. Perusal of bail order dated 30.07.2021 whereby the husband of the complainant was granted bail, would reveal that husband of the complainant wants to amicably settle the matter and willing to go to the Mediation Centre for settlement. Further, applicant herein is a senior citizen. Incarcerating the applicant may tantamount to crossing the Rubicon, for an arrest may obviate chances of reconciliation, if any. Thus, this Court does not deem it fit to allow apprehension of the applicant by the police at this juncture, so long as the applicant cooperates and joins the investigation as and when called for. Accordingly, applicant is granted anticipatory bail on the following conditions:-

- a) In the event of arrest, applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO.
- b) The applicant is directed not to leave the country without intimation to the IO.
- c) The applicant shall join investigation as and when called for and shall return all the dowry articles.
- d) The applicant is directed to give all her mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.

- e) The applicant shall give her address to the IO and if she changes the address she shall intimate the same to the IO.
- f) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the applicant is trying to contact him / her and trying to put pressure on him/her then the protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.
9. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.
10. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1031/21
FIR NO. 83/21
PS Timarpur
U/s 354/354-B/452/506/509/427 IPC
State vs Deepak Mavi

23.09.2021

Vide Order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Wazirabad and Crime Branch of Central Police District through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. Santosh Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant /
accused through VC.
IO/WSI Neelam through VC.

Ld. Counsel for accused submitted that he was not able to convince the patient or his family members to admit the accused inpatient evaluation. Thus, Ld. Counsel for accused submitted that present matter be heard on merits.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused Deepak Mavi. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicant /accused submitted that present case is essentially a dispute between two neighbors over a parking issue. It has further been submitted that perusal of FIR would reveal that the offence allegedly took place in February. However, the FIR was lodged belatedly after lapse of more than a month i.e., on 16.03.2021. Further, it has been submitted that vague allegations have been made qua the applicant/accused and thus the accused ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State, assisted by Ld Counsel for the Complainant, vehemently opposed the application. He submitted that specific allegations have been made against the accused. Further, the accused, according to the State the accused has put-forth an untenable view that the accused was mentally fit to stand trial, and thus anticipatory bail should not be not granted.

4. Before adverting to the rival contentions of the parties, the facts of the present case, as alleged by the prosecution, are hereby

succinctly recapitulated: The present FIR was lodged on 16.03.2021 on the complaint of complainant Anita wherein she alleged that on 06.02.2021, the accused herein entered her house and started abusing and also threatened to shoot her. Complainant further alleged in her complaint that on 11.02.2021, accused Deepak Mavi again entered her house and started abusing her. He also touched her breast and tore her Kurta and said that “mere ye pakad” and after that he fled away from the spot. Next morning the complainant found that the windows of her car was broken. After that on 16.03.2021 victim came to PS Timarpur and gave her statement and thus the present FIR came to be registered.

5. At this juncture, it would be apposite to reproduce the following extracts of *Bhadresh Bipin Bhai Sheikh Vs. State of Gujrat, 2016 1 SCC 152* :-

“The principles for grant of anticipatory bail can be summarised as follows:-

(x) The following factors and parameters needs to be taken into consideration while dealing with anticipatory bail.

(a) The nature and gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made.

(b) The antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether the accused has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a Court in respect of any

cognizable offence;

(c) The possibility of the applicant to flee from justice

(d) The possibility of the accused's likelihood to repeat similar or other offences:

(e) Where the accusation have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her;

(f) Impact of grant of anticipatory bail particularly in cases of large magnitude affecting a very large number of people;

(g) The courts must evaluate the entire available material against the accused very carefully. The court must also clearly comprehend the exact role of the accused in the case. The cases in which the accused is implicated with the help of Sections 34 and 149 of the penal Code, 1860 the court should consider with even greater care and caution, because over implication in the cases is a matter of common knowledge and concern”

(h) While considering the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, a balance has to be struck between two factors, namely, no prejudice should be caused to free, fair and full investigation, and there should be prevention of harassment, humiliation and unjustified detention of the accused;

(i) The court should consider reasonable apprehension of tampering of the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant;

(j) Frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail and in the even of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of bail.

6. Perusal of record would reveal that there has indeed been delay in registering the FIR, for reasons best known to the complainant. Further, it is a case in which no recovery is to be effected, and that custodial interrogation of the accused herein is not required. Further, taking into account the previous proceedings, even though it could not be established with certainty that accused is suffering from mental illness, the court is inclined to take a lenient view. It is thus apparent that no purpose would be served incarcerating the accused at this juncture. Under these circumstances, this court is of the opinion that the accused Deepak Mavi be granted anticipatory bail. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the following conditions:

- a) Thus, in the event of arrest, he shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bond and surety bond of Rs. 10,000/- alongwith one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO concerned.
- b) The petitioner is directed not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
- c) The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called for.
- d) The petitioner is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.
- e) The petitioner shall give his address to the IO and if he changes

the address he shall intimate the same to the IO.

f) The accused shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the accused is trying to contact him/her and trying to put pressure on him/her then the protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.

9. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.

10. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL.
SESSIONS JUDGE/SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY,
COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2450/21

FIR NO. 438/21

PS Burari

U/s 498A/406/34 IPC

State vs Mool Chand

23.09.2021

Vide Order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Wazirabad and Crime Branch of Central Police District through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
through VC.

Sh. Bansant Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused through VC.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon

the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused Mool Chand. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicants submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case at the instance of complainant. Ld. Counsel for the accused further submitted that no direct allegations have been levelled against the accused herein, and the allegations are vague in nature, and no notice has been received to join the investigation from IO, and thus it was submitted that the accused ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State and IO have opposed the application as per law. Ld. APP submitted that applicant has not joined the investigation despite the notice given under Section 91 Cr.P.C.

4. Submissions heard.

5. Before adverting to the rival contentions of the parties, the facts of the present case, as alleged by the

prosecution, are hereby succinctly recapitulated: On 17.06.2021, a complaint has been given by complainant Ms. Rekha that she was mentally, physically harassed and beaten by her in laws in connection with bringing less dowry at the time of marriage. Therefore, the present FIR came to be registered.

6. In matters pertaining to matrimonial disputes, it would be apposite to refer to the following extract of ***Udit Raj Poonia Vs. State (Government of NCT of Delhi) 2017 (1) DLT (Cri) 805 :-***

23. This Court is of the considered opinion that in matters of matrimonial cases, the Investigating Officer is required to first make out whether any article is to be recovered. In case, he is of the view that any article is to be recovered then he is to decide whether the custodial interrogation of any of the accused is required for the purpose of recovery of article. Without reaching to the conclusion with regard to recovery of article, whether it is stridhan article or any other article, the Investigating Officer is not to arrest the person for the recovery of the same.

24. Similarly, the bail application ought not be rejected for setting the

scores between the parties.

25. As per the discussions made above, this Court view that :

****Provisions of Section 41 Cr.P.C. and the guidelines issued vide Standing Order Nos. 330/2008 and 444/2016 are mandatory in nature and must be complied with***

****The DCP/ACP shall ensure that the alleged articles are in existence and the recovery/seizure could take place without the arrest, in other words, that arrest is the only mode in the facts and circumstances to effect the recovery before granting the sanction to arrest.***

****Similarly, the Court while considering the bail under Section 437, 438,439 Cr.P.C. shall refused the bail in exceptional circumstances.***

**** The exceptional circumstances may be assessed by the court concerned and the bail application must be decided expeditiously.***

****In the matrimonial cases bail is a rule and refusal is an exception.***

7. Further, it would be apt to peruse the following extracts of ***Bhadresh Bipin Bhai Sheth Vs. State of Gujarat & Anr., (2016) 1 Supreme Court Cases 152:-***
“The principles for grant of anticipatory bail can be

summarised as follows:-

(i).....

(ii).....

(iii) It is imperative for the courts to carefully and with meticulous precision evaluate the facts of the case. The discretion to grant bail must be exercised on the basis of the available material and the facts of the particular case. In cases where the court is of the considered view that the accused has joined the investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigating agency and is not likely to abscond, in that event, custodial interrogation should be avoided. A great ignominy, humiliation and disgrace is attached to arrest. Arrest leads to many serious consequences not only for the accused but for the entire family and at times for the entire community. Most people do not make any distinction between arrest at a pre-conviction stage or post-conviction stage.....”

8. A perusal of the record reveals that the applicant herein is the father in law of complainant. A perusal of the FIR would reveal that, as per the complainant, the husband and other family members used to demand money and other dowry related expenses and that she was pressurized and subjected to rude behavior. The allegations of beatings also have not been substantiated by any medical document on record. This averment further reflects that there is scope for hearts to melt

and for the parties riven asunder to be restored to *status quo ante* position. Incarcerating the applicant may tantamount to crossing the Rubicon, for an arrest may obviate chances of reconciliation, if any. Thus, this Court does not deem it fit to allow apprehension of the applicant by the police at this juncture, so long as the applicant cooperates, and joins the investigation as and when called for. Accordingly, applicant is granted anticipatory bail on the following conditions:-

- a) In the event of arrest, applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO.
- b) The applicant is directed not to leave the country without intimation to the IO.
- c) The applicant shall join investigation as and when called for.
- d) The applicant is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.
- e) The applicant shall give his address to the IO and if he changes the address he shall intimate

the same to the IO.

f) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the applicant is trying to contact him and trying to put pressure on him then the protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.

9. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.

10. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2442/21
FIR No. 416/2021
U/s 498A/406/34 IPC
P.S. Wazirabad
State Vs. Rajender Prasad

23.07.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been filed on behalf of accused Rajendra Prasad for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through VC.
Sh. Vijender Singh Dhangar, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.
Report of IO received.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused Rajender Prasad. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.
2. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submitted that applicant is the father in law of complainant, and he is a senior citizen. Ld. Counsel has vehemently contended that the present issue is a matrimonial dispute between the son of the accused herein and the complainant, and that

marriage solemnized without his consent. Ld. Counsel has further submitted that husband of the complainant has already been anticipatory granted bail. Thus, applicant ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld. Addl. PP for the State alongwith IO vehemently opposed the present anticipatory bail application as per law.
4. Before adverting to the rival contentions of the parties, the facts of the present case, as alleged by the prosecution, are hereby succinctly recapitulated: It is alleged by the complainant that she got married to the applicant on 29.01.2020. After some time of marriage the applicant and his family started demanding money and other items from the complainant. Complainant stated that she was not only beaten, harassed and tortured but also was abused physically and sexually by her husband.
5. In matters pertaining to matrimonial dispute, it would be apposite to refer to the following extract of ***Udit Raj Poonia Vs. State (Government of NCT of Delhi) 2017 (1) DLT (Cri) 805 :-***

“23. This Court is of the considered opinion that in matters of matrimonial cases, the Investigating Officer is required to first make out whether any article is to be recovered. In case, he is of the view that any article is to be recovered then he is to decide whether the custodial interrogation of any of the accused is required for the purpose of recovery of article. Without reaching to the conclusion with regard to recovery of article, whether it is stridhan article or any other article, the Investigating Officer is not to arrest the person for the recovery of the same.

24. Similarly, the bail application ought not be rejected for setting the scores between the parties.

25. As per the discussions made above, this Court view that :
*Provisions of Section 41 Cr.P.C. and the guidelines issued vide Standing Order Nos. 330/2008 and 444/2016 are mandatory in nature and must be complied with
*The DCP/ACP shall ensure that the alleged articles are in existence and the recovery/seizure could take place without the arrest, in other words, that arrest is the only mode in the facts and circumstances to effect the recovery before granting the sanction to arrest.
*Similarly, the Court while considering the bail under Section 437, 438,439 Cr.P.C. shall refused the bail in exceptional circumstances.
* The exceptional circumstances may be assessed by the court concerned and the bail application must be decided expeditiously.
*In the matrimonial cases bail is a rule and refusal is an exception.”

6. Regarding the issue of cooperation with the investigating agencies, it would be apposite to reproduce the following extracts of **Bhadresh Bipin Bhai Sheth Vs. State of Gujarat & Anr., (2016) 1 Supreme Court Cases 152:-**

7. “The principles for grant of anticipatory bail can be summarised as follows:-

(i).....

(ii).....

(iii) It is imperative for the courts to carefully and with meticulous precision evaluate the facts of the case. The discretion to grant bail must be exercised on the basis of the available material and the facts of the particular case. **In cases where the court is of the considered view that the accused has joined the investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigating agency and is not**

likely to abscond, in that event, custodial interrogation should be avoided. A great ignominy, humiliation and disgrace is attached to arrest. Arrest leads to many serious consequences not only for the accused but for the entire family and at times for the entire community. Most people do not make any distinction between arrest at a pre-conviction stage or post-conviction stage.....”

8. Perusal of bail order dated 30.07.2021 whereby the husband of the complainant was granted bail, would reveal that husband of the complainant wants to amicably settle the matter and willing to go to the Mediation Centre for settlement. Further, applicant herein is a senior citizen. Incarcerating the applicant may tantamount to crossing the Rubicon, for an arrest may obviate chances of reconciliation, if any. Thus, this Court does not deem it fit to allow apprehension of the applicant by the police at this juncture, so long as the applicant cooperates and joins the investigation as and when called for. Accordingly, applicant is granted anticipatory bail on the following conditions:-

- a) In the event of arrest, applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO.
- b) The applicant is directed not to leave the country without intimation to the IO.
- c) The applicant shall join investigation as and when called for and shall return all the dowry articles.
- d) The applicant is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.

- e) The applicant shall give his address to the IO and if he changes the address he shall intimate the same to the IO.
 - f) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the applicant is trying to contact him / her and trying to put pressure on him/her then the protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.
9. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.
10. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2401/2021
FIR No.236/21
U/s 379/356/34 IPC
P.S. Gulabi Bagh
State Vs. Rakesh

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. has been filed on behalf of accused Rakesh for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Tarun Arora, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.
IO/HC Harender is present through VC.

ORDER ON BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the bail application filed on behalf of the accused. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.
2. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It was submitted that recovery has already been effected. Lastly, it was submitted that

accused is in J/C since 18.08.2021, and no purpose would be served keeping the accused in J/C. Thus, accused ought to be granted bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State alongwith IO vehemently opposed the bail application as per law.
4. Submission heard record perused.
5. A perusal of the record reveals that recovery has already been effected, and identity of the accused has not been cogently established as per reply of the IO. Further, accused is already in JC since 18.08.2021. It is pertinent to note that the apprehensions of the IO that applicant may threaten the witnesses have not been substantiated. This Court cannot rely on the mere *ipse dixit* of the IO that the applicant would again commit an offence if enlarged on bail.
6. Under these circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that no purpose would be served in keeping the applicant in custody any longer. Accordingly, the accused Rakesh is admitted on bail on furnishing bail bond and surety bond of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of Ld CMM/Ld. MM/Ld. Link MM/Ld. Duty MM as the case may be, subject to the following conditions:
 - i. He shall not establish any contact with the complainant or any other witness, nor try threaten influence, intimidate etc. any witness.

- ii. He shall not hamper the trial or investigation in any manner.
 - iii. He shall furnish his present and permanent address with supporting documents alongwith affidavit/undertaking to inform about ant change qua the same, without any delay, to the IO/Court.
 - iv. He shall join the investigation/attend trial without default.
7. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the bail application stands disposed off.
8. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2399/2021
FIR No.022159/21
U/s 379 IPC
P.S. Bara Hindu Rao
State Vs. Rakesh

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad Video Conferencing Mode.

Present application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. has been filed on behalf of accused Rakesh for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Tarun Arora, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.
IO/HC Harender is present through VC.

ORDER ON BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the bail application filed on behalf of the accused. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.
2. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It was submitted that alleged recovery has been planted upon the accused. Lastly, it

was submitted that accused is in J/C since 18.08.2021, and no purpose would be served keeping the accused in J/C. Thus, accused ought to be granted bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State alongwith IO vehemently opposed the bail application as per law. It was submitted that accused is a habitual offender. It was submitted that applicant herein facilitated the commission of the crime and thus he ought not to be granted bail.
4. Submission heard record perused.
5. A perusal of the record reveals that recovery has already been effected, and identity of the accused has not been cogently established as per reply of the IO. Further, accused is already in JC since 18.08.2021. It is pertinent to note that the apprehensions of the IO that applicant may threaten the witnesses have not been substantiated. This Court cannot rely on the mere *ipse dixit* of the IO that the applicant would again commit an offence if enlarged on bail.
6. Under these circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that no purpose would be served in keeping the applicant in custody any longer. Accordingly, the accused Rakesh is admitted on bail on furnishing bail bond and surety bond of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of Ld CMM/Ld. MM/Ld. Link MM/Ld. Duty MM as the case may be, subject to the following conditions:

- i. He shall not establish any contact with the complainant or any other witness, nor try threaten influence, intimidate etc. any witness.
 - ii. He shall not hamper the trial or investigation in any manner.
 - iii. He shall furnish his present and permanent address with supporting documents alongwith affidavit/undertaking to inform about any change qua the same, without any delay, to the IO/Court.
 - iv. He shall join the investigation/attend trial without default.
7. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the bail application stands disposed off.
8. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL.
SESSIONS JUDGE/SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY,
COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2448/21

FIR NO. 438/21

PS Burari

U/s 498A/406/34 IPC

State vs Manisha

23.09.2021

Vide Order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Wazirabad and Crime Branch of Central Police District through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
through VC.

Sh. Bansant Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused through VC.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon

the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused Smt. Manisha. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicants submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case at the instance of complainant. Ld. Counsel for the accused further submitted that no direct allegations have been levelled against the accused herein, and the allegations are vague in nature, and no notice has been received to join the investigation from IO. Ld. Counsel further submitted that applicant herein is a minor and, thus, it was submitted that the accused ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State and IO have opposed the application as per law. Ld. APP submitted that applicant has not joined the investigation despite the notice given under Section 91 Cr.P.C.

4. Submissions heard.

5. Before adverting to the rival contentions of the

parties, the facts of the present case, as alleged by the prosecution, are hereby succinctly recapitulated: On 17.06.2021, a complaint has been given by complainant Ms. Rekha that she was mentally, physically harassed and beaten by her in laws in connection with bringing less dowry at the time of marriage. Therefore, the present FIR came to be registered.

6. In matters pertaining to matrimonial disputes, it would be apposite to refer to the following extract of ***Udit Raj Poonia Vs. State (Government of NCT of Delhi) 2017 (1) DLT (Cri) 805 :-***

23. This Court is of the considered opinion that in matters of matrimonial cases, the Investigating Officer is required to first make out whether any article is to be recovered. In case, he is of the view that any article is to be recovered then he is to decide whether the custodial interrogation of any of the accused is required for the purpose of recovery of article. Without reaching to the conclusion with regard to recovery of article, whether it is stridhan article or any other article, the Investigating Officer is not to arrest the person for the recovery of the same.

24. Similarly, the bail application

ought not be rejected for setting the scores between the parties.

25. As per the discussions made above, this Court view that :

***Provisions of Section 41 Cr.P.C. and the guidelines issued vide Standing Order Nos. 330/2008 and 444/2016 are mandatory in nature and must be complied with**

***The DCP/ACP shall ensure that the alleged articles are in existence and the recovery/seizure could take place without the arrest, in other words, that arrest is the only mode in the facts and circumstances to effect the recovery before granting the sanction to arrest.**

***Similarly, the Court while considering the bail under Section 437, 438,439 Cr.P.C. shall refused the bail in exceptional circumstances.**

*** The exceptional circumstances may be assessed by the court concerned and the bail application must be decided expeditiously.**

***In the matrimonial cases bail is a rule and refusal is an exception.**

7. Further, it would be apt to peruse the following extracts of *Bhadresh Bipin Bhai Sheth Vs. State of Gujarat & Anr., (2016) 1 Supreme Court Cases 152:-*

“The principles for grant of anticipatory bail can be summarised as follows:-

(i).....

(ii).....

(iii) It is imperative for the courts to carefully and with meticulous precision evaluate the facts of the case. The discretion to grant bail must be exercised on the basis of the available material and the facts of the particular case. In cases where the court is of the considered view that the accused has joined the investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigating agency and is not likely to abscond, in that event, custodial interrogation should be avoided. A great ignominy, humiliation and disgrace is attached to arrest. Arrest leads to many serious consequences not only for the accused but for the entire family and at times for the entire community. Most people do not make any distinction between arrest at a pre-conviction stage or post-conviction stage.....”

8. A perusal of the record reveals that the applicant herein is the sister in law of complainant. A perusal of the FIR would reveal that, as per the complainant, the husband and other family members used to demand money and other dowry related expenses and that she was pressurized and subjected to rude behavior. The allegations of beatings also have not been substantiated by any medical document on record. This averment further reflects that there is scope for hearts to melt

and for the parties riven asunder to be restored to *status quo ante* position. Incarcerating the applicant may tantamount to crossing the Rubicon, for an arrest may obviate chances of reconciliation, if any. Thus, this Court does not deem it fit to allow apprehension of the applicant by the police at this juncture, so long as the applicant cooperates, and joins the investigation as and when called for. Accordingly, applicant is granted anticipatory bail on the following conditions:-

- a) In the event of arrest, applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO.
- b) The applicant is directed not to leave the country without intimation to the IO.
- c) The applicant shall join investigation as and when called for.
- d) The applicant is directed to give all her mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.
- e) The applicant shall give her address to the IO and if she changes the address she shall

intimate the same to the IO.

f) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the applicant is trying to contact her and trying to put pressure on her then the protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.

9. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.

10. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL.
SESSIONS JUDGE/SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY,
COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2449/21

FIR NO. 438/21

PS Burari

U/s 498A/406/34 IPC

State vs Guddi

23.09.2021

Vide Order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Wazirabad and Crime Branch of Central Police District through Video Conferencing Mode.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State
through VC.

Sh. Bansant Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused through VC.

ORDER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon

the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the accused Smt. Guddi. Arguments were heard *in extenso*, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicants submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case at the instance of complainant. Ld. Counsel for the accused further submitted that no direct allegations have been levelled against the accused herein, and the allegations are vague in nature, and no notice has been received to join the investigation from IO, and thus it was submitted that the accused ought to be granted anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, Ld Addl. PP for the State and IO have opposed the application as per law. Ld. APP submitted that applicant has not joined the investigation despite the notice given under Section 91 Cr.P.C.

4. Submissions heard.

5. Before adverting to the rival contentions of the parties, the facts of the present case, as alleged by the

prosecution, are hereby succinctly recapitulated: On 17.06.2021, a complaint has been given by complainant Ms. Rekha that she was mentally, physically harassed and beaten by her in laws in connection with bringing less dowry at the time of marriage. Therefore, the present FIR came to be registered.

6. In matters pertaining to matrimonial disputes, it would be apposite to refer to the following extract of ***Udit Raj Poonia Vs. State (Government of NCT of Delhi) 2017 (1) DLT (Cri) 805 :-***

23. This Court is of the considered opinion that in matters of matrimonial cases, the Investigating Officer is required to first make out whether any article is to be recovered. In case, he is of the view that any article is to be recovered then he is to decide whether the custodial interrogation of any of the accused is required for the purpose of recovery of article. Without reaching to the conclusion with regard to recovery of article, whether it is stridhan article or any other article, the Investigating Officer is not to arrest the person for the recovery of the same.

24. Similarly, the bail application ought not be rejected for setting the

scores between the parties.

25. As per the discussions made above, this Court view that :

****Provisions of Section 41 Cr.P.C. and the guidelines issued vide Standing Order Nos. 330/2008 and 444/2016 are mandatory in nature and must be complied with***

****The DCP/ACP shall ensure that the alleged articles are in existence and the recovery/seizure could take place without the arrest, in other words, that arrest is the only mode in the facts and circumstances to effect the recovery before granting the sanction to arrest.***

****Similarly, the Court while considering the bail under Section 437, 438,439 Cr.P.C. shall refused the bail in exceptional circumstances.***

**** The exceptional circumstances may be assessed by the court concerned and the bail application must be decided expeditiously.***

****In the matrimonial cases bail is a rule and refusal is an exception.***

7. Further, it would be apt to peruse the following extracts of ***Bhadresh Bipin Bhai Sheth Vs. State of Gujarat & Anr., (2016) 1 Supreme Court Cases 152:-***
“The principles for grant of anticipatory bail can be

summarised as follows:-

(i).....

(ii).....

(iii) It is imperative for the courts to carefully and with meticulous precision evaluate the facts of the case. The discretion to grant bail must be exercised on the basis of the available material and the facts of the particular case. In cases where the court is of the considered view that the accused has joined the investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigating agency and is not likely to abscond, in that event, custodial interrogation should be avoided. A great ignominy, humiliation and disgrace is attached to arrest. Arrest leads to many serious consequences not only for the accused but for the entire family and at times for the entire community. Most people do not make any distinction between arrest at a pre-conviction stage or post-conviction stage.....”

8. A perusal of the record reveals that the applicant herein is the mother in law of complainant. A perusal of the FIR would reveal that, as per the complainant, the husband and other family members used to demand money and other dowry related expenses and that she was pressurized and subjected to rude behavior. The allegations of beatings also have not been substantiated by any medical document on record. This averment further reflects that there is

scope for hearts to melt and for the parties riven asunder to be restored to *status quo ante* position. Incarcerating the applicant may tantamount to crossing the Rubicon, for an arrest may obviate chances of reconciliation, if any. Thus, this Court does not deem it fit to allow apprehension of the applicant by the police at this juncture, so long as the applicant cooperates, and joins the investigation as and when called for. Accordingly, applicant is granted anticipatory bail on the following conditions:-

- a) In the event of arrest, applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO.
- b) The applicant is directed not to leave the country without intimation to the IO.
- c) The applicant shall join investigation as and when called for.
- d) The applicant is directed to give all her mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.
- e) The applicant shall give her address to the IO

and if she changes the address she shall intimate the same to the IO.

f) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the applicant is trying to contact her and trying to put pressure on her then the protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.

9. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed off.

10. Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2476/21
FIR No. 525/21
U/s 304/288/34 IPC
P.S. Subzi Mandi
State Vs. Mohak Arora

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

Present application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. has been moved on behalf of applicant Mohak Arora for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Sh. Chetan Anand, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.
Let report of IO be called for 27.09.2021.
Order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2471/21

FIR No. 86/21

U/s 308/394/395 IPC

P.S. Subzi Mandi

State Vs. Anupam Pandey

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

Present application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. has been moved on behalf of applicant Mohak Arora for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.

Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Let report of IO be called for 28.09.2021.

Order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

**(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2472/21

FIR No. 515/21

U/s 186/353/506/34 IPC

P.S. Subzi Mandi

State Vs. Nanhe Koli

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

Present application u/s 439 Cr.P.C. has been moved on behalf of applicant Mohak Arora for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.

Sh. R.P. Tyagi, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Let report of IO be called for 29.09.2021.

Order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

**(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2473/21

FIR No. Not Known

U/s Not Known

P.S. Timarpur

State Vs. Mohammad Adil

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been moved on behalf of applicant Mohammad Ali for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.

Sh. Feroz Ahmed, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Let report of IO be called for 01.10.2021.

Order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

**(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2474/21

FIR No. Not Known

U/s Not Known

P.S. Timarpur

State Vs. Mohd. Adnan

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been moved on behalf of applicant Mohd. Adnan for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.

Sh. Feroz Ahmed, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Let report of IO be called for 01.10.2021.

Order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

**(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2475/21

FIR No. 721/21

U/s 308/34 IPC

P.S. Burari

State Vs. Vinay

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been moved on behalf of applicant Vinay for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.

Sh. R.K. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant through VC.

Let report of IO be called for 25.09.2021.

Order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

**(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE/
SPECIAL JUDGE, ELECTRICITY, COURT NO. 2, CENTRAL, THC**

Bail Application No. 2451/21
FIR No. 501/21
U/s 307/34 IPC & 25/54/59 Arms Act
P.S. Subzi Mandi
State Vs. Seema

23.09.2021

Vide order No. 887/37133-168/Bail Power/Gaz/2021 dated 01.07.2021 issued by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Delhi, the undersigned has been authorized to dispose of bail / urgent criminal applications pertaining to the PS Pratap Nagar (Gulabi Bagh), Civil Lines, Roop Nagar, Timarpur, Burari, Subzi Mandi, Bara Hindu Rao, Maurice Nagar, Crime Branch of Central Police District and Wazirabad.

Present application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. has been moved on behalf of applicant Seema for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. Balbir Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.

Sh. Pardeep Kadiyan, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Complainant in person.

IO/SI Vijay Singh alongwith Inspector Rajender, SHO, P.S. Subzi Mandi also present.

Ld. Counsel has moved the present application for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant. He submitted that he has erroneously mentioned it as the first anticipatory bail application where in fact it is the second anticipatory bail application. Reply thereto also has been filed by the IO.

At this juncture Ld. Counsel for accused has submitted that there are changes in circumstances in as much as complaint has been made against

Contd.....

the IO, as mentioned in para-3 of his application. Ld. Counsel for the accused has placed copy of the said complaint. Copy of the same has been supplied to the State.

At this juncture, Ld. Addl. PP for the State seeks more time to file additional reply.

Put up for filing the additional reply and arguments on 29.09.2021.

Order be uploaded on the website of the District Court.

(Arul Varma)
ASJ/Special Judge, Electricity
Court No. 02, Central
Tis Hazari/Delhi/23.09.2021