

State vs Mohd. Ziya
e-FIR No.020377/20
PS Pandav Nagar
U/s 379/411 IPC
27.04.2021

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.
Ms. Sunita Singh Ld. LAC for the accused through VC.
An application for grant of bail u/s 437 Cr.P.C moved on behalf
of accused Mohd. Ziya has been forwarded by the Jail Superintendent
concerned.

Ld. LAC submitted that inadvertently in the present bail
application the FIR number is mentioned as 20377/21 but the correct FIR
number is 20377/20.

Bail application perused. Reply filed by IO also perused.

Ld. LAC for the accused has submitted that accused is in JC
since 30.01.2021. Ld. LAC has further submitted that accused has been
falsely implicated in the present case and he has responsibilities of his
family. Further, recovery shown from the accused, if any, has been planted
upon him. Ld. Counsel has also submitted that accused is no more required
for the purpose of investigation. Accused is ready to furnish reliable surety.

Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application of the
accused stating that the allegations are serious in nature and accused can
commit similar offence in future.

Heard both the parties.

In the present case, the accused is in J/C since 30.01.2021.
Case property in the present case has already been recovered.
Chargesheet has been filed in the present case. Trial is likely to take time.
Further, the aspect of de-congestion of jails in light of Covid-19 pandemic
is also a relevant consideration. Keeping in view the entire facts and
circumstances of the case, accused **Mohd. Ziya** is admitted to Court bail
on furnishing of bail bond in the sum of **Rs. 5,000/- with one surety in the
like amount** subject to the conditions that :-

1. Accused shall not indulge in similar offence as that of which he
is the accused.
2. He will not try to tamper with the evidence and will not try to
contact the complainant during the pendency of the case.

Accordingly, bail application disposed off. Copy of this order be sent
to the Id. LAC for the accused on his email ID and the same be uploaded
on the Delhi District Court Website today itself.

Copy of this order be also sent to Jail superintendent concerned for
information to the accused.

(Aakanksha Vyas)
Link MM, (East) KKD Court
Delhi/27.04.2021

State vs Maneet
e-FIR No.020951/20
PS Pandav Nagar
U/s 379/34 IPC
27.04.2021

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Ms. Priyanka Bhardwaj Ld. LAC for the accused through VC.

An application for grant of bail u/s 437 Cr.P.C moved on behalf of accused Maneet.

Ld. LAC submitted that inadvertently in the present bail application the FIR number is mentioned as 20991/20 but the correct FIR number is 20951/20.

Bail application perused. Reply filed by IO also perused.

Ld. LAC for the accused has submitted that accused is in JC since more than one month. Ld. LAC has further submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case. Further, recovery shown from the accused, if any, has been planted upon him. Ld. Counsel has also submitted that chargesheet has already been filed and accused is no more required for the purpose of investigation. Accused is ready to furnish reliable surety.

Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application of the accused stating that the allegations are serious in nature and can commit similar offence in future.

Heard both the parties.

In the present case, the accused is in J/C since long time. Case property in the present case has already been recovered. Chargesheet has been filed in the present case. Trial is likely to take time. Further, the aspect of de-congestion of jails in light of Covid-19 pandemic is also a relevant consideration. Keeping in view the entire facts and circumstances of the case, accused **Maneet** is admitted to Court bail on furnishing of bail bond in the sum of **Rs. 5,000/- with one surety in the like amount** subject to the conditions that :-

1. Accused shall not indulge in similar offence as that of which he is the accused.
2. He will not try to tamper with the evidence and will not try to contact the complainant during the pendency of the case.

Accordingly, bail application disposed off. Copy of this order be sent to the Ld. LAC for the accused on his email ID and the same be uploaded on the Delhi District Court Website today itself.

(Aakanksha Vyas)

Link MM, (East) KKD Court
Delhi/27.04.2021

State vs Kavita
FIR No. 118/21
PS Kalyanpuri
U/s 33 Delhi Excise Act
27.04.2021

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Sh. Devender Kumar, Id. counsel for the accused through VC.

An application for grant of bail u/s 437 Cr.P.C is moved on behalf of accused Kavita @ Chuhiya.

Bail application perused. Reply filed by IO also perused.

Ld. Counsel for the accused has submitted that accused is in JC since 01.04.2021. Ld. Counsel has further submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and she is the sole bread earner of her family. Further, recovery shown from the accused, if any, has been planted upon her. Ld. Counsel has also submitted that accused is no more required for the purpose of investigation. Accused is ready to furnish reliable surety.

Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application of the accused stating that the allegations are serious in nature. Further, as per reply of IO, accused is habitual offender and can commit similar offence in future.

Heard both the parties.

In the present case, the accused was arrested on 31.03.2021 and since then she is in J/C. Case property in the present case has already been recovered. IO has not disclosed previous involvement of the accused in a similar offence. Further, the aspect of de-congestion of jails in light of Covid-19 pandemic is also a relevant consideration. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, accused Kavita is admitted to Court bail on furnishing of bail bond in the sum of **Rs. 5,000/- with one surety in the like amount** subject to the conditions that :-

1. The accused shall cooperate with the IO during the investigation.
2. Accused shall not indulge in similar offence as that of which he is the accused.
3. He will not try to tamper with the evidence and will not try to contact the complainant during the pendency of the case.

Accordingly, bail application disposed off. Copy of this order be sent to the Id. Counsel for the accused on his email ID and the same be uploaded on the Delhi District Court Website today itself.

(Aakanksha Vyas)
Link MM, (East) KKD Court
Delhi/27.04.2021

State vs Intezar
FIR No. 118/21
PS Pandav Nagar

27.04.2021

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Ms. Priyanka Bhardwaj, Id. LAC for the accused through VC.

An application for grant of bail u/s 437 Cr.P.C is moved on behalf of accused Intezar.

Bail application perused. Reply filed by IO also perused.

Ld. LAC for the accused has submitted that accused is in JC for about one month. Ld. LAC has further submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is the sole bread earner of his family. Further, recovery shown from the accused, if any, has been planted upon him. Ld. LAC has also submitted that accused is no more required for the purpose of investigation. Accused is ready to furnish reliable surety.

Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application of the accused stating that the allegations are serious in nature. Further, as per reply of IO, accused is a habitual offender and can commit similar offence in future. The Id. APP also submitted that in the present case, the accused has been apprehended at the spot but neither his accomplice has been apprehended till date nor has the case property been recovered till date.

Heard both the parties.

In the present case, the accused is in J/C since 03.03.2021. In so far as the accused is concerned, the period of custodial interrogation is already over. As the accused is no more required for investigation, no purpose will be served by keeping him in custody any longer. Further, the aspect of de-congestion of jails in light of Covid-19 pandemic is also a relevant consideration. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, accused **Intezar** is admitted to Court bail on furnishing of bail bond in the sum of **Rs. 10,000/- with one surety in the like amount** subject to the conditions that :-

1. The accused shall cooperate with the IO during the investigation.
2. Accused shall not indulge in similar offence as that of which he is the accused.
3. He will not try to tamper with the evidence and will not try to contact the complainant during the pendency of the case.

Accordingly, bail application disposed off. Copy of this order be sent to the Id.LAC for the accused on his email ID and the same be uploaded on the Delhi District Court Website today itself.

(Aakanksha Vyas)
Link MM, (East) KKD Court
Delhi/27.04.2021

State vs Vicky @ Deepak
FIR No. 42/21
PS Kalyanpuri
U/s 33 Delhi Excise Act

27.04.2021

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.
Sh. Devender Kumar, Id. counsel for the accused through VC.
An application for grant of bail u/s 437 Cr.P.C is moved on behalf
of accused Vicky @ Deepak.
Bail application perused. Reply filed by IO also perused.

Ld. Counsel for the accused has submitted that this is the first
bail application after the filing of the chargesheet. Further the accused is in
JC since 12.02.2021. Ld. Counsel has further submitted that accused has
been falsely implicated in the present case and he is a young person of 28
years. Further, recovery shown from the accused, if any, has been planted
upon him. Ld. Counsel has also submitted that accused is no more required
for the purpose of investigation. Accused is ready to furnish reliable surety.

Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application of the
accused stating that the allegations are serious in nature. Further, as per
reply of IO, accused is the B.C. of his area and he is a habitual offender
and can commit similar offence in future.

Heard both the parties.

In the present case, as per reply of IO, the accused is in J/C
since 14.02.2021. Case property in the present case has already been
recovered. Although the IO has disclosed criminal antecedents of the
accused, the IO has not mentioned the current status of the accused in the
cases in which the accused is alleged to be involved. Office has informed
the undersigned that chargesheet has been filed in the present case.
Further, the reply of IO also shows that the accused has no involvement in
the similar offence. He is no more required for investigation. Trial is likely to
take time. Further, the aspect of de-congestion of jails in light of Covid-19
pandemic is also a relevant consideration. Keeping in view the facts and
circumstances of the case, accused Vicky @ Deepak is admitted to Court
bail on furnishing of bail bond in the sum of **Rs. 10,000/- with one surety**
in the like amount subject to the conditions that :-

1. The accused shall cooperate with the IO during the investigation.
2. Accused shall not indulge in similar offence as that of which he is the accused.
3. He will not try to tamper with the evidence and will not try to contact the complainant during the pendency of the case.

Accordingly, bail application disposed off. Copy of this order be sent to the Id. Counsel for the accused on his email ID and the same be uploaded on the Delhi District Court Website today itself.

(Aakanksha Vyas)
Link MM (East)

State vs Shahraj @ Matthi
e-FIR No. 34242/20
PS Pandav Nagar
U/s 379/411/34 IPC
27.04.2021

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Sh.Umesh Kumar, Id. counsel for the accused through VC.

I have perused the application. I have also perused the reply of IO. As per reply of IO, the present e-FIR is not registered in PS Pandav Nagar. Hence, the present bail application is dismissed.

Accordingly, bail application disposed off. Copy of this order be sent to the Id. counsel for the accused on his email ID and the same be uploaded on the Delhi District Court Website today itself.


(Aakanksha Vyas)
Link MM, (East) KKD Court
Delhi/27.04.2021