

State vs. Mohd. Khalid

FIR No. 53/21
PS: Shakarpur
U/sec. 411 IPC

13.08.2021

Present: Learned APP for the State through V/C
Learned counsel for the accused through V/C

COURT IS CONVENED THROUGH V/C (CISCO WEBEX)

Vide this order, I shall decide the application filed on behalf of accused *Mohd. Khalid* seeking regular bail.

It is stated by the learned counsel for the accused that he is running in J/C since 20.07.2021 and charge-sheet has already been filed. He therefore, prayed that bail may be granted.

Bail application is vehemently opposed by the learned APP for the State. He submitted that accused is habitual offender and if bail is granted, he may indulge in similar activities.

Heard. File perused.

Perusal of the file reveals that accused was formally arrested by the IO. Challan has already been filed. Trial will take some time. Therefore, I deem it fit to admit the accused *Mohd. Khalid* on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety in the like amount amount.

Bail application stands disposed of.

Copy dasti.

Copy of the order be sent to the jail Suprintendent for information and record.

(BABITA PUNIYA)
MM-05, East District
KKD Delhi, 13.08.2021

FIR No. 0173/21
STATE vs. Aniket
PS PIA
U/s 392/411/34 IPC

13.08.2021

Matter taken up through video conferencing via Cisco Webex Meeting App vide order No. 438/RG/DHC/2021 dated 22.07.2021 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Vide this order, I shall decide the bail application filed on behalf of applicant/accused Aniket.

Present: Ld. App for the state through VC.

Sh. Sanjay Tomar, Ld. counsel for applicant / accused.

Learned counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that a false case has been foisted against him; he has no complicity in the crime and is in judicial custody since 25.05.2021 and is not a previous convict or offender. He further submitted that applicant/accused would abide by the terms and conditions imposed by this Court if the prayer as set out in the application is granted.

Bail application is vehemently opposed by the learned APP for the State.

I have heard the arguments and have also perused the reply filed by the IO.

After hearing the learned counsel for the applicant/accused and the learned APP for the State and going through the contents of the reply, I am of the considered

view that the applicant/accused is not entitled to the concession of regular bail at this stage. Allegations leveled against him are serious in nature. Apprehension of the prosecution that he may influence the witnesses and may tamper with evidence cannot be ruled out. Under the circumstances, keeping in view the nature of the crime alleged, the bail application is dismissed.

Copy *dasti*.

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


(Babita Puniya)
MM-05, (East) KKD Court
/Delhi/13.08.2021

FIR No. 0096/21
STATE vs. Sachin Kumar
PS PIA
u/s 392/394/34 IPC

13.08.2021

Matter taken up through video conferencing via Cisco Webex Meeting App vide order No. 438/RG/DHC/2021 dated 22.07.2021 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present:- Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Mohd. Dilshad, Ld. counsel for applicant.

The present application for release of mobile phone **OPP F15 Blue color** (IMEI No. 863115046452472 and 86311506452464) on Superdari has been filed by the applicant.

Reply has been filed under the signature of ASI Sudhir Kumar, wherein it is submitted that there is no objection for the release of the mobile phone to the rightful owner.

In view of the no objection of the IO, oral arguments of Ld. Counsel for applicant are dispensed with.

In these circumstances the aforesaid mobile phone be released to the **rightful owner only (after verification of ownership)** subject to satisfaction of the IO/ SHO about the following conditions:

1. IO shall prepare detailed panchnama mentioning the colour, appearance, IMEI number, ownership and other necessary details of the mobile phone:
2. IO shall take the colour photographs of the mobile phone from different angles.
3. The photographs should be attested and counter signed by the complainant, accused and rightful owner (after verification of ownership).
4. IO shall take the security bond of appropriate value from the rightful owner, taking into consideration the value / bill / receipt of the mobile phone to the satisfaction of the concerned IO/ SHO subject to verification of documents.

Copy of this order be sent to Ld. Counsel for applicant on his email ID and a copy be also sent to the SHO PS concerned for compliance and the same be uploaded on the Delhi District Courts Website today itself.

(Babita Puniya)
MM-5, (East) KKD
Court/Delhi/13.08.2021