

FIR No. 161/2020  
PS: Prem Nagar  
State Vs. Firoz Khan  
U/s 25/54/59 of Arms Act

**An application has been moved by IO/HC Manoj Kumar requesting the case to JJB and the subsequent transfer of CCL to Observation Home.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State.  
IO/HC Manoj Kumar in person.

Perusal of the case record shows that the accused was remanded to judicial custody vide order dated 6.5.2020 with the direction to be produced on 20.5.2020 before the court concerned. Subsequently, the IO filed an application for obtaining the date of birth of the accused in order to determine whether he was a minor at the time of commission of alleged offence. Vide certificate date 8.5.2020, the Principal of Nigam Pratibha Bal Vidyalaya, Prem Nagar-II, Rohini Zone, Delhi-110086 stated that the date of birth of Firoz Khan was 11.07.2002. The offence in the present case was allegedly committed on 5.5.2020. Therefore, it becomes apparently clear that the age of accused at the time of commission of the alleged offence was 17 years 9 months and 27 days and thus, he was minor at the time of commission of the alleged offence.

In the light of above factual situation, let the proceedings of the present case be transferred to Ld. JJB concerned and the Jail Superintendent, Tihar is further directed to transfer the Child in conflict with law to the concerned Observation Home. Application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.

- 2 -

A copy of this order be supplied to the IO and a copy of the order be marked to Incharge Computer Department, Rohini Courts for uploading the same on the official website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

E-FIR No. 001279/2020  
PS: Prem Nagar  
State Vs. Vishnu @ Babloo  
U/s 379/411 of IPC

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

Reply filed by ASI Satish Kumar. Same is taken on record.

Arguments heard from both sides on the aspect of bail.

From the perusal of the case record alongwith the reply filed, it becomes apparently clear that the accused is in JC since 15.02.2020 i.e. for a period of more than two months.

In light of the decision of the Apex Court in Writ Petition 1/2020 and directions of High Power Committee of Hon'ble High Court wherein persons in judicial custody for a period of more than 15 days in offences punishable under a term of upto 7 years have been directed to be released on interim bail for a period of 45 days on furnishing personal bond to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned, the bail application of accused is allowed subject to him furnishing personal bond to the extent of Rs.20,000/- to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned, who (Jail Superintendent concerned) is directed not to insist on the production of surety.

At this stage, it would be pertinent to state that the said order has been made without going into the merits of the case and interim bail has been granted in light of the prevailing Covid-19 situation and directions of Hon'ble Apex Court for taking of appropriate steps for decongestion of jail complexes.

Accused shall however be bound by directions as given by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in this regard.

Application is disposed off accordingly.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

Original order and bail application be sent to concerned Court.

Copy of order be also sent to Jail Superintendent for information and compliance.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 415/19  
PS: Kanjhawala  
State Vs. Deepak Dabas @ Teetar  
U/s 387/506 of IPC

**An application for release of accused Deepak Dabas @ Teetar has been filed by IO/SI Sunil Kumar.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State.

IO/SI Sunil Kumar in person.

Accused Deepak Dabas @ Teetar is stated to be in J/C but not present today.

It is stated by the IO that the accused was formally arrested in the present matter but no recovery was effected from the accused. He further states that there is no incriminating evidence against the accused in the present matter at this stage and hence, he may kindly be discharged.

Heard. In view of submissions and as there is no incriminating evidence against the accused at this stage, therefore, the accused is discharged under Section 169 of Cr.P.C. in the present matter. He be released from custody if not required in any other case.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.

A copy of this order be supplied to the IO and a copy of the order be marked to Incharge Computer Department, Rohini Courts for uploading the same on the official website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 243/2020  
PS: Sultan Puri  
State Vs. Dharmender @ Golu  
U/s 25 of Arms Act

**Manual court proceedings.**

**Fresh Chargesheet received.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State.

IO/ASI Rajesh in person in person.

Accused Aniket @ Kale is stated to be in J/C but not appearing today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **05.06.2020 at 02:00 PM** or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning, whichever is later.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

e-FIR No. 033346/19  
PS: North Rohini

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

None for the accused.

Perusal of the case record shows that court notice had been issued vide order dated 24.04.2020 to Jail Superintendent, Distt. Jail Meerut for filing of compliance report alongwith a direction to SHO concerned to depute an official for obtaining verification report from Meerut Jail regarding the receipt of interim bail order by them.

No compliance report has been filed by Jail Superintendent Meerut nor has the reply of show cause issued by this Court vide order dated 06.05.2020 been filed by the SHO concerned.

Such being the case, let a fresh show cause notice be issued against the SHO concerned in terms of order dated 06.05.2020. A copy of the same be also forwarded to the DCP concerned for necessary action and filing of the compliance report returnable for **11.05.2020**.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

Smt.Sapna Paul vs. Neeraj Paul

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Deepak Saini, Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Ld Counsel for applicant has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

Perusal of the case record shows that the present application has been filed for the custody of two minor daughters of the applicant stating that the accused has hid them in an unknown place since 21.02.2020 and has not allowed the applicant to meet them.

At the outset, it would be pertinent to mention that the present application has been filed after a delay of almost 3 months since the alleged occurrence of domestic violence against the applicant and the alleged subsequent act of hiding of the minor daughters of the applicant, by the accused. The Ld. Counsel for applicant concedes that the applications by the applicant to the SHO, PS Shalimar Bagh dated 16.03.2020 does not contain any averment towards the fact that the accused has hid the minor daughters of the applicant. No plausible explanation has been furnished by the applicant behind the delay of almost two months in filing of the first application and the subsequent/present application.

Furthermore, the application is totally silent as to the place of hiding of the minor daughters as well as overt act on the part of the respondent/accused towards stopping the applicant from meeting with the minor daughters. There are only bland and unsubstantiated suggestions / averments / statements by the applicant that the respondent/accused has hid the minor daughters at some place unknown to the applicant. It would be also pertinent to note here that the country is under Lockdown in light of the prevailing Covid-19 situation and any transport / conveyance is not available which would enable the respondent/accused to flee / hide the minor children of the applicant at any place outside the territorial limits of NCT. It is therefore nigh impossible that the minor daughters of the



applicant would be taken outside territorial limits of NCT. It would also not be outside the nigh of reason the prevalent Lockdown would have contributed towards the applicant not being able to meet her daughters.

Moreover, recent judgment of the Apex Court titled “Tanuj Dhawan vs. Court on its Own Motion” dated 30.04.2020 has categorically stated that in case the applicant is not able to meet children, to whom they have visitation rights, electronic medium may be resorted to for achieving the same. The application is totally silent on steps if any taken by the applicant to achieve audience with her children, via electronic medium.

In light of the above discussions, this Court is of the considered opinion that the present application filed on behalf of the applicant does not disclose any urgent ground which would justify the taking up of the same on an urgent basis at this particular time. This application is accordingly dismissed.

Copy of this order be given to all parties concerned.

A copy of the order be marked to Incharge Computer Department, Rohini Courts for uploading the same on the official website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 335/2020  
PS: Raj Park  
State Vs. Albela & Anr.  
U/s 188/269/270/34 of IPC

**Online court proceedings.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for applicant.

Ld Counsel for applicant has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

Perusal of case record shows that the concerned Ahlmad was directed to be present alongwith original order and authority letter vide order dated 06.05.2020. However, he is not in attendance today. Let fresh court notice be issued to the concerned Ahlmad through Administration Branch for **09.05.2020 at 02.00 p.m.**

A copy of the order be marked to Incharge Computer Department, Rohini Courts for uploading the same on the official website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

e-FIR no. 045219/19  
PS: South Rohini  
State Vs. Aniket @ Kale  
U/s 379/411 IPC

**Manual court proceedings.**

**Fresh Chargesheet received.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State.

IO/HC Prem Prakash in person.

Accused Aniket @ Kale is stated to be in J/C but not appearing today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **05.06.2020 at 02:00 PM** or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning, whichever is later.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 56/2020  
PS: Rani Bagh  
State Vs. Ratnesh Ram  
U/s 363/376 of IPC

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Sh.Rajesh Kanojia (in person), Ahlmad in the court of Ld. ACMM Sh.Atul Krishan Aggarwal.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

Reply filed by Sh.Rajesh Kanojia. Same is taken on record.

Perusal of the case record shows that release warrants had been received back from Jail Superintendent Tihar stating that the accused could not be released on account of the fact that Section 6 of POCSO Act was not mentioned in the said release order.

Perusal of the reply filed by Sh.Rajesh Kanojia makes it clear that as per the bail order passed by Ld. Sessions Court, Section 6 of POCSO Act had not been mentioned and therefore, the same was not mentioned on the release warrant issued by him.

At this stage, Ld. Counsel for accused states that he wishes to file an appropriate application in the court of Ld. Sessions Judge for rectification regarding the above situation.

A copy of the reply filed by Ahlmad in court of Ld. ACMM and report received from Jail Superintendent Tihar be supplied to Ld. Counsel for accused. The application is accordingly disposed off. A copy of the order be given to all the parties concerned.

- 2 -

A copy of the order be marked to Incharge Computer Department, Rohini Courts for uploading the same on the official website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 869/19  
PS: Mangol Puri  
State Vs. Sunny  
U/s 25/54/59 of Arms Act

**Online court proceedings.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

Reply filed by HC Navdeep Tyagi. Same is taken on record.

Arguments heard from both sides on the aspect of bail.

From the perusal of the case record alongwith the reply filed, it becomes apparently clear that investigation in the present case has been completed and the charge sheet has already been filed. It is also apparently clear that the accused is in JC since 10.09.2019 i.e. for a period of almost seven months.

In light of the decision of the Apex Court in Writ Petition 1/2020 and directions of High Power Committee of Hon'ble High Court wherein persons in judicial custody for a period of more than 15 days in offences punishable under a term of upto 7 years have been directed to be released on interim bail for a period of 45 days on furnishing personal bond to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned, the bail application of accused is allowed subject to him furnishing personal bond to the extent of Rs.20,000/- to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned, who (Jail Superintendent concerned) is directed not to insist on the production of surety.

At this stage, it would be pertinent to state that the said order has been made without going into the merits of the case and interim bail has been granted in

light of the prevailing Covid-19 situation and directions of Hon'ble Apex Court for taking of appropriate steps for decongestion of jail complexes.

Accused shall however be bound by directions as given by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in this regard.

Application is disposed off accordingly.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

Original order and bail application be sent to concerned Court.

Copy of order be also sent to Jail Superintendent for information and compliance.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 241/2020  
PS: Vijay Vihar  
State Vs. Manjeet  
U/s 33 of Delhi Excise Act

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Sh.Ramesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for accused, Enrollment No.D-1991 of 2004.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

At the outset, Ld. Counsel for the accused states that the vakalatnama in the present case could not be filed due to the ongoing Covid-19 situation and he undertakes to file the same within a month from today. Ld. Counsel for accused is directed to file vakalatnama within one month from today.

Arguments heard from both sides on the aspect of bail. From the perusal of the case record, it becomes apparently clear that no ground has been mentioned in the urgency format attached with the present bail application which would justify the taking up of the present case on an urgent basis. Moreover, no medical records have been annexed by the Ld. Counsel for accused to substantiate the claims made in para 4 of the bail application.

In light of the same, this Court is not inclined to consider the present application as urgent. The application is accordingly rejected.

A copy of the order sheet alongwith the case record be sent to the court concerned.



A copy of the order be marked to Incharge Computer Department, Rohini Courts for uploading the same on the official website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 65/2020  
PS: Mourya Enclave  
State Vs. Shahid Khan  
U/s 380/411 of IPC

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

At the onset of virtual court proceedings, the Ld. Counsel for accused states that he wishes to withdraw the present application.

At his request, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn. The application is disposed accordingly.

A copy of this order be marked to Computer Incharge to upload the same on official Website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 196/2020  
PS: Ashok Vihar  
State Vs. Raja Ram  
U/s 33/38 of Delhi Excise Act

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

At the onset of virtual court proceedings, the Ld. Counsel for accused concedes that his application is incomplete as undertaking for filing of relevant documents / court fees on re-opening of courts is missing. He states that he wishes to withdraw the present application.

At his request, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn. The application is disposed accordingly.

A copy of this order be marked to Computer Incharge to upload the same on official Website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 421/19  
PS: Bharat Nagar  
State Vs. Pawan  
U/s 380 of IPC

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

Reply filed by HC Kailash. Same is taken on record.

At the outset, Ld. Counsel for the accused states that the vakalatnama in the present case could not be filed due to the ongoing Covid-19 situation and she undertakes to file the same within a month from today. She further states that an undertaking in this regard has been annexed / attached with the case record. Ld. Counsel for accused is directed to file vakalatnama within one month from today.

Arguments heard from both sides on the aspect of bail.

From the perusal of the case record alongwith the reply filed, it becomes apparently clear that investigation in the present case has been completed and the case property has already been recovered and handed over to the complainant. Furthermore, the co-accused in the present case has also been enlarged on bail. It is also apparently clear from the perusal of the case record that the accused is in JC since 30.08.2019 i.e. for a period of almost eight months. Moreover, the co-accused has already been enlarged on bail.

In light of the decision of the Apex Court in Writ Petition 1/2020 and directions of High Power Committee of Hon'ble High Court wherein persons in judicial custody for a period of more than 15 days in offences punishable under a term of upto 7 years have been directed to be released on interim bail for a period of 45 days on furnishing personal bond to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned, the bail application of accused is allowed subject to him furnishing personal bond to the extent of Rs.20,000/- to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned, who (Jail Superintendent concerned) is directed not to insist on the production of surety.

At this stage, it would be pertinent to state that the said order has been made without going into the merits of the case and interim bail has been granted in light of the prevailing Covid-19 situation and directions of Hon'ble Apex Court for taking of appropriate steps for decongestion of jail complexes.

Accused shall however be bound by directions as given by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in this regard.

Application is disposed off accordingly.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

Original order and bail application be sent to concerned Court.

Copy of order be also sent to Jail Superintendent for information and compliance.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 869/19  
PS: Mangol Puri  
State Vs. Sunny  
U/s 25/54/59 of Arms Act

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

At the outset, Ld. Counsel for the accused states that

Arguments heard from both sides on the aspect of bail. From the perusal of the case record alongwith the reply filed, it becomes apparently clear that investigation in the present case is ongoing and the co-accused are at large and yet to be arrested.

In light of the above facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the accused at this stage. The application is accordingly rejected.

A copy of the order sheet alongwith the case record be sent to the court concerned.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 160/2020  
PS: Prem Nagar  
State Vs. Manoj Kumar  
U/s 33 of Delhi Excise Act and 188 of IPC

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Sh.Manish Chandra, Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

It is stated by Ld. Counsel for accused that he does not want to press the present bail application at this stage and wants to withdraw the same.

Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed as withdrawn.

Copy of this order be marked to Computer Incharge to upload the same on official Website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. 152/2020  
PS: Bharat Nagar  
State Vs. Lakhan  
U/s 392/34 of IPC

**Due to spread of Covid-19 and subsequent special measures taken by Govt. to prevent its transmission, hearing of the present matter has been conducted through video conferencing using CISCO Webex Meeting App after taking consent of all parties concerned in terms of circular dated 21.4.2010.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Sh.Vipul Sehrawat, Ld. Proxy Counsel on behalf of Ld. Counsel Sh.Kashmir Singh, Enrollment No.D-37 of 1985.

Ld Proxy Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

At the outset, Ld. Proxy Counsel for the accused states that the vakalatnama in the present case could not be filed due to the ongoing Covid-19 situation and he undertakes to file the same within a month from today. He further states that an undertaking in this regard has been annexed / attached with the case record. Ld. Proxy Counsel for accused is directed to file vakalatnama within one month from today.

Arguments heard from both sides on the aspect of bail. From the perusal of the case record alongwith the reply filed, it becomes apparently clear that investigation in the present case is ongoing and the co-accused are at large and yet to be arrested.

In light of the above facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the accused at this stage. The application is accordingly rejected.

A copy of the order sheet alongwith the case record be sent to the court concerned.



A copy of the order be marked to Incharge Computer Department, Rohini Courts for uploading the same on the official website today itself.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. \*\*\*

PS:

State Vs.

U/s

**Online court proceedings.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Sh.Ravi Kumar, Ld. APP for the State in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused.

Ld Counsel for accused has been contacted through video conferencing on Webex Meeting App.

**(PRITU RAJ)**

**Duty MM: North West**

**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No. \*\*\*  
PS:  
State Vs.  
U/s 411 IPC

**Fresh Chargesheet received.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

IO \_\_\_\_\_ in person.

Accused \_\_\_\_\_ is stated to be in J/C but not appearing today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **05.06.2020 at 02:00 PM** or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning, whichever is later.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

FIR No.  
PS:  
State Vs.  
U/s

**Manual court proceedings.**

**08.05.2020**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.  
None for the accused.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**

CC No.

vs.

### **Online Proceedings**

**08.05.2020**

Present : None for the applicant.

Ld. counsel for applicant was contacted over the mobile phone.

The present application has been received at 3:00 PM. Ld Counsel for the applicant was contacted over the phone, wherein he stated that he does not want to press the present application.

Accordingly, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.

Copy of this order be marked to Computer Incharge to upload the same onofficial Website by today.

**(PRITU RAJ)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/08.05.2020**