

①

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Kulbhushan

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.

Present:- Sh. Ram Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Arguments heard.

It was submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is being falsely implicated in a false case by the complainant. The allegations levelled against the applicant are false and baseless. Now, the applicant has the apprehension of his arrest in that case by the police. Therefore, the applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, the Ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application submitting that no FIR has been registered against the applicant in the Police Station, at this stage and only a complaint is pending against the applicant in CAW Cell. It was further argued that the applicant is not to be arrested, at this stage. Therefore, the application is not maintainable.



1


FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Kulbhushan

-2-

In view of the submission of the Ld. Addl. PP, the applicant is not to be arrested at this stage as at present there is no FIR against the applicant, so the applicant has no apprehension of his arrest in this case, at this stage. The application is dismissed. However, in case the applicant has to be arrested, IO shall give five days notice to the applicant prior to the arrest of the applicant. The applicant is directed to join the inquiry/ investigation as and when required by the IO.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the Id. Counsel for the applicant through e-mail.


(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

2

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Saroj Singh

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.

Present:- Sh. Ram Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Arguments heard.

It was submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is being falsely implicated in a false case by the complainant. The allegations levelled against the applicant are false and baseless. Now, the applicant has the apprehension of her arrest in that case by the police. Therefore, the applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, the Ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application submitting that no FIR has been registered against the applicant in the Police Station, at this stage and only a complaint is pending against the applicant in CAW Cell. It was further argued that the applicant is not to be arrested, at this stage. Therefore, the application is not maintainable.



2


FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Saroj Singh

-2-

In view of the submission of the Ld. Addl. PP, the applicant is not to be arrested at this stage as at present there is no FIR against the applicant, so the applicant has no apprehension of her arrest in this case, at this stage. The application is dismissed. However, in case the applicant has to be arrested, IO shall give five days notice to the applicant prior to the arrest of the applicant. The applicant is directed to join the inquiry/ investigation as and when required by the IO.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the Id. Counsel for the applicant through e-mail.


(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

3

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Divan Singh

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.

Present:- Sh. Ram Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Arguments heard.

It was submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is being falsely implicated in a false case by the complainant. The allegations levelled against the applicant are false and baseless. Now, the applicant has the apprehension of his arrest in that case by the police. Therefore, the applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, the Ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application submitting that no FIR has been registered against the applicant in the Police Station, at this stage and only a complaint is pending against the applicant in CAW Cell. It was further argued that the applicant is not to be arrested, at this stage. Therefore, the application is not maintainable.



3


FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Divan Singh

-2-

In view of the submission of the Ld. Addl. PP, the applicant is not to be arrested at this stage as at present there is no FIR against the applicant, so the applicant has no apprehension of his arrest in this case, at this stage. The application is dismissed. However, in case the applicant has to be arrested, IO shall give five days notice to the applicant prior to the arrest of the applicant. The applicant is directed to join the inquiry/ investigation as and when required by the IO.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the ld. Counsel for the applicant through e-mail.


(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

4

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Jitender

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.

Present:- Sh. Ram Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Arguments heard.

It was submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is being falsely implicated in a false case by the complainant. The allegations levelled against the applicant are false and baseless. Now, the applicant has the apprehension of his arrest in that case by the police. Therefore, the applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, the Ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application submitting that no FIR has been registered against the applicant in the Police Station, at this stage and only a complaint is pending against the applicant in CAW Cell. It was further argued that the applicant is not to be arrested, at this stage. Therefore, the application is not maintainable.



4


FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Jitender

-2-

In view of the submission of the Ld. Addl. PP, the applicant is not to be arrested at this stage as at present there is no FIR against the applicant, so the applicant has no apprehension of his arrest in this case, at this stage. The application is dismissed. However, in case the applicant has to be arrested, IO shall give five days notice to the applicant prior to the arrest of the applicant. The applicant is directed to join the inquiry/ investigation as and when required by the IO.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the Id. Counsel for the applicant through e-mail.


(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.05.2020

5

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Hemant

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.

Present:- Sh. Ram Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Arguments heard.

It was submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is being falsely implicated in a false case by the complainant. The allegations levelled against the applicant are false and baseless. Now, the applicant has the apprehension of his arrest in that case by the police. Therefore, the applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, the Ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application submitting that no FIR has been registered against the applicant in the Police Station, at this stage and only a complaint is pending against the applicant in CAW Cell. It was further argued that the applicant is not to be arrested, at this stage. Therefore, the application is not maintainable.



5

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Hemant

-2-

In view of the submission of the Ld. Addl. PP, the applicant is not to be arrested at this stage as at present there is no FIR against the applicant, so the applicant has no apprehension of his arrest in this case, at this stage. The application is dismissed. However, in case the applicant has to be arrested, IO shall give five days notice to the applicant prior to the arrest of the applicant. The applicant is directed to join the inquiry/ investigation as and when required by the IO.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the ld. Counsel for the applicant through e-mail.



(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

6

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Manju

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.


Present:- Sh. Ram Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

Arguments heard.

It was submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is being falsely implicated in a false case by the complainant. The allegations levelled against the applicant are false and baseless. Now, the applicant has the apprehension of her arrest in that case by the police. Therefore, the applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, the Ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application submitting that no FIR has been registered against the applicant in the Police Station, at this stage and only a complaint is pending against the applicant in CAW Cell. It was further argued that the applicant is not to be arrested, at this stage. Therefore, the application is not maintainable.



6

FIR No. Not Known
U/s Not Known
PS: CAW Cell
State Vs. Manju

-2-

In view of the submission of the Ld. Addl. PP, the applicant is not to be arrested at this stage as at present there is no FIR against the applicant, so the applicant has no apprehension of her arrest in this case, at this stage. The application is dismissed. However, in case the applicant has to be arrested, IO shall give five days notice to the applicant prior to the arrest of the applicant. The applicant is directed to join the inquiry/ investigation as and when required by the IO.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the Id. Counsel for the applicant through e-mail.



(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

7

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. 81/2020

U/s 323/341/354/427/452/506/509/34 IPC

PS: Pandav Nagar

State Vs. Rajinder Kohli

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.

Present:- Sh. Prashant Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/
accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco
Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through
Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

A common reply is filed which is kept in the bail
application of Rajinder Kohli.

Arguments heard. Reply perused.

It was submitted by the ld. Counsel for the applicant/
accused that the applicant/ accused has the apprehension of his
arrest in a false case. The present case is a counterblast to the FIR
lodged by the accused party against the complainant side. Charge
sheet has not been filed yet. Therefore, the applicant/ accused may
be granted anticipatory bail.

The ld. Addl. PP has opposed the application on the
ground that this is the second application for grant of anticipatory
bail. There is no change in circumstances after the dismissal of the
earlier bail application of the applicant/ accused. Therefore, the
application is not maintainable and the same may be dismissed.

This is the second application moved by the applicant/
accused for grant of anticipatory bail. The first one was dismissed
by Dr. S.K.Gautam Ld. ASJ vide order dated 18.03.2020 with the
observation that custodial interrogation of the applicant/ accused is
required. More than three months have passed but there is nothing
on record to show that the IO has taken any step to apprehend or



7

FIR No. 81/2020

U/s 323/341/354/427/452/506/509/34 IPC

PS: Pandav Nagar

State Vs. Rajinder Kohli

-2-

arrest the applicant/ accused during the said long period. IO to file detailed reply showing the details of investigation and the steps taken by him for the arrest of the applicant/ accused during the said period.

Put up on 08.07.2020 for consideration. Till then, the applicant/ accused shall not be arrested subject to his joining investigation as and when required.

Copy of this order be sent to Id. Counsel for the applicant/ accused through e-mail.



(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)

Additional Sessions Judge -05

Karkardooma Courts (East District)

Delhi/26.06.2020

8

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI.**

FIR No. 81/2020

U/s 323/341/354/427/452/506/509/34 IPC

PS: Pandav Nagar

State Vs. Nirmala

26.06.2020

Pursuant to Order No. 3919-39/D&SJ/(East)/KKD/Delhi dated 15.06.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge (East) this application has been put up before the undersigned.

Present:- Sh. Prashant Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/
accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco
Webex.

Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through
Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.

A common reply is filed which is kept in the bail
application of Rajinder Kohli.

Arguments heard. Reply perused.

It was submitted by the ld. Counsel for the applicant/
accused that the applicant/ accused has the apprehension of her
arrest in a false case. The present case is a counterblast to the FIR
lodged by the accused party against the complainant side. Charge
sheet has not been filed yet. Therefore, the applicant/ accused may
be granted anticipatory bail.

The ld. Addl. PP has opposed the application on the
ground that this is the second application for grant of anticipatory
bail. There is no change in circumstances after the dismissal of the
earlier bail application of the applicant/ accused. Therefore, the
application is not maintainable and the same may be dismissed.

This is the **third** application as mentioned in the
application moved by the applicant/ accused for grant of
anticipatory bail. One application was dismissed by Dr.
S.K.Gautam Ld. ASJ vide order dated 18.03.2020 with the
observation that custodial interrogation of the applicant/ accused is
required. There is no mention as to when the second application



8.


FIR No. 81/2020
U/s 323/341/354/427/452/506/509/34 IPC
PS: Pandav Nagar
State Vs. Nirmala

-2-

was moved and dismissed. The ld. Counsel shall supply the complete particulars in this regard by the next date. More than three months have passed after the dismissal of the application on 18.03.2020 but there is nothing on record to show that the IO has taken any step to apprehend or arrest the applicant/ accused during the said long period. IO to file detailed reply showing the details of investigation and the steps taken by him for the arrest of the applicant/ accused during the said period.

Put up on 08.07.2020 for consideration. Till then, the applicant/ accused shall not be arrested subject to her joining investigation as and when required.

Copy of this order be sent to ld. Counsel for the applicant/ accused through e-mail.


(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

A

**IN THE COURT OF SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE -05, EAST DISTRICT
KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI**

SC No. 1528/2016
FIR No.483/15
U/s 307/302/323/120B/34 IPC
PS: Kalyan Puri
State Vs. Anuj @ Anna & Anr.

26.06.2020

Present:- Sh. Sudhakar Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/
accused through Video Conferencing on Cisco
Webex.
Sh. Gaurav Pandey, Ld. Addl. PP for State through
Video Conferencing on Cisco Webex.
Conduct report of the applicant/ accused Rahul @

Kancha s/o Shri Padam Bahadur received from the Jail.

Reply received.

Arguments heard.

Put up at 2.00 p.m. for order.



(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

26.06.2020

Taken up again for order

Present None.

Order

1. This order shall dispose off the bail application u/s 439
Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of the applicant/ accused Rahul @ Kancha
for grant of bail/interim bail for 45 days.



A

SC No. 1528/2016
FIR No.483/15
U/s 307/302/323/120B/34 IPC
PS: Kalyan Puri
State Vs. Anuj @ Anna & Anr.

-2-

2. I have already heard the Id. Counsel for the applicant/ accused and the Id. Addl. PP for the State. Reply and conduct report of the applicant/ accused Rahul @ Kancha perused.

3. It was submitted by the Id. Counsel for the applicant/ accused that the applicant / accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The applicant/ accused was arrested on 23.05.2015. It was submitted that the applicant/ accused may be granted interim bail for a period of 45 days as per resolution dated 18.05.2020 passed by the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court.

4. On the other hand, it was submitted by the Ld. Addl. PP for the State on the ground that the allegations against the applicant/ accused are serious in nature and therefore, he should not be granted bail.

5. The applicant/ accused is seeking interim bail on the basis of recommendations dated 18.05.2020 of the High Powered Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court. The applicant/ accused is in JC since 23.05.2015. No other involvement is reported against him. His conduct report as received from Jail is 'May be treated as Good. Keeping in view the overall circumstances, I am of the



A


SC No. 1528/2016
FIR No.483/15
U/s 307/302/323/120B/34 IPC
PS: Kalyan Puri
State Vs. Anuj @ Anna & Anr.

-3-

considered opinion that it would be in the interest of justice to grant interim bail to the applicant/ accused for a period of 45 days from the date of his release and on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned and subject to the condition that the applicant/ accused shall not try to contact or influence the witnesses directly or indirectly and he shall not indulge himself in any such activity which can be prejudicial to the fair trial of the case.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent for information through e-mail.


(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

(B)

SC No. 821/17
FIR No. 240/2017
U/s 302/364/120B/34 IPC
PS: Mayur Vihar
State Vs. Sandeep Kumar Sharma

26.06.2020

Present: Sh. Roop Ram Sarwal, Advocate for accused Sandeep Kumar Sharma.

File taken up today on the application on behalf of accused Sandeep Kumar Sharma for calling report from Jail Superintendent as to why the accused has not been released.

Heard. File perused.

Yesterday the bail bonds on behalf of the applicant/ accused Sandeep Kumar Sharma was accepted. Direction was issued to the Jail Superintendent to release the accused Sandeep Kumar Sharma after obtaining personal bond from him. It was specifically mentioned in the order that surety bond has been accepted. Despite that accused Sandeep Kumar Sharma has not been released from Jail. So, release warrant be issued to Jail Superintendent for releasing the accused Sandeep Kumar Sharma after obtaining personal bond from him in terms of order dated 25.06.2020, if the accused Sandeep Kumar Sharma is not wanted in any other case.

The application stands disposed off accordingly.



(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020

(C)


SC No.1393/18
FIR No. 95/18
PS: Ghazi Pur
State vs. Varun Thakur

26.06.2020

File taken up today on presentation of the bail bond by the counsel for the applicant/ accused Varun Thakur.

Present: Counsel for the applicant/ accused with surety.

The applicant/ accused was granted interim bail by Dr. S.K.Gautam Ld. ASJ till 15.7.2020. Today, the counsel for the applicant/ accused has presented bail bonds along with certified copy of the bail order. Bail bonds presented and accepted till 15.07.2020. Release warrant be issued to the Jail Superintendent for releasing the applicant/ accused Varun Thakur after obtaining a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 70,000/-.


(SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA)
Additional Sessions Judge -05
Karkardooma Courts (East District)
Delhi/26.06.2020