

**IN THE COURT OF ACMM -EAST KKD DELHI**

**State vs. Pradeep Sarawagi**

**FIR No: 40/2017**

**PS EOW**

**U/s 420/406/467/468/471/120B, IPC**

**29.10.2020**

**This bail application under Section 437 Cr.P.C is marked to this court by ld. CMM (East). The present application has been taken up today through Video Conference according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present: Sh. Ramesh Bajiya, Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Sh. Tarunveer Singh and Sh. Robins Fransics Verma, ld.

Counsels for the applicant/accused.

Sh. Gaurav Seth, ld. Counsel for the complainant.

IO SI Anurag from EOW.

The accused is stated to be in JC.

Proceedings are conducted through VC.

Digital copy of the charge sheet has been received.

Ld. counsel for the applicant/accused would argue that applicant/accused is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the matter. He is in custody since 02.12.2019. There is no material on record to show that the accused had committed the offences. As per the record, there were no direct dealings between the accused and the complainant/victim. The IO had not conducted investigation properly.

He did not obtain the bank statement of the account of the accused from the concerned bank. He was supposed to obtain a Court order for the said purpose. However, he mentioned in the challan that the bank had refused to provide the copy. The accused was not the director of the company. He was merely manager in the said company. No document was ever signed by the accused in relation to the transaction with complainant. The material on record is not sufficient to prove the guilt of the accused. In any case, the nature of evidence on record is documentary which have already been collected by the IO. Therefore, there is no apprehension of tempering of the evidence. The passport of the accused has already been seized by the IO. The accused is an Indian citizen and therefore he is not a flight risk. Charge sheet has already been filed. No purpose would be served by keeping the applicant/accused behind bars. The applicant is ready to furnish sound surety. He is ready to abide by all the conditions imposed by the Court. The accused is a sick person. He is suffering with various ailments and he needs regular medication to remain healthy. There are chances that his health might deteriorate in the jail. Hence, it is prayed that applicant may be released on bail. Ld. Counsel has shown various medical documents of the applicant/accused prepared during his treatment in the jail to show that he is sick. Ld. Counsel has also relied upon the following judgments to support his contentions :-

- (i) Rajat Sharma vs. GNCTD, (2015) 3 DLT (Cri.) 69
- (ii) P. Chidambaram vs. Directorate of Enforcement 2019 SCC Online 1549
- (iii) P. Chidambaram vs. CBI 2019 SCC Online 1380

(iv) Sanjay Chandra vs. CBI (2012) 1 SCC 40

Ld. APP has opposed the bail application. It has been argued, inter alia, that the allegations against the applicant/accused are serious in nature. The accused has been named in the FIR. The material on record is sufficient to prima facie show that the accused has sent forged certificate to the complainant. During investigation, it has been found that the certificate was not uploaded on the site of DGFT as required by the law. During investigation, the reply has also been received from the concerned company that no such certificate was available with them. It has also been shown prima facie that it was the accused, who had cheated the complainant by sending waste material in the consignment. There is report of the joint survey conducted by the authorities, wherein it is mentioned that the seals of the containers were intact at the time of examination. It was the accused, who was actively involved in the dealing with the complainant. He was the authorized signatory of the company and therefore, he was looking after day-to-day affairs of the company. Even in the records of the concerned department at the US, name of the accused only is mentioned in the documents of the company. Further, the accused is falsely taking the plea of sickness. It is mentioned in the documents of the jail records produced by the Id. Counsel for the applicant that the applicant was avoiding taking food properly on time. Therefore, he is trying to create circumstances to show that he is sick. In any case, there are sufficient medical facilities available in the jail for all the inmates. The applicant/accused is using those facilities. He is a flight risk. Hence, it

is prayed that the bail application may be dismissed.

I have heard the submissions and perused the record.

Perusal of the charge sheet would show that it has been filed for offences punishable u/s 420/406/467/468/471/120-B IPC. The name of the accused is mentioned in the FIR itself. It is also prima facie shown that the accused is the authorized signatory of M/s Ambi Metals LLC. There is a certificate in the challan which is stated to be forged. This court has received the present application of bail of the accused for deciding the same as per law from the court of Id. CMM (East). As above mentioned, in the charge sheet the accused is also charge-sheeted for an offence punishable u/s 467 IPC. While hearing arguments on bail application, this court cannot decide the merits of the case and therefore, it cannot be decided by this court at this stage whether the material is sufficient to disclose commission of offence punishable u/s 467 IPC or not. Offence punishable u/s 467 IPC provide the sentence of life imprisonment. Section 437, Cr.P.C. provides power inter-alia, of a magistrate to grant bail to an accused of commission of a non bailable offence. However, the Section provides that a magistrate cannot grant bail to an accused, if there appear reasonable grounds for believing that he has been guilty of an offence punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Court on its own motion Vs. State Criminal reference no. 1/2018, decided on 13.11.2018 [(2018) 254 DLT 641 (DB) ] has held that in the cases where the Court of Magistrate has reason to believe that the accused has committed an offence where the punishment is either the capital punishment, or imprisonment for life, the Magistrate cannot grant bail to such an accused. The Hon'ble

High Court of Delhi in *Court on its own motion Vs. State, criminal reference no. 1/2017 dt. 24.10.2017* also has held that a magistrate can grant bail under section 437(1) Cr.P.C subject to the proviso therein in sub clause (i) or (ii). Thus, it has been held by the Hon'ble High Court that in cases where the punishment for an offence is death or life imprisonment, a magistrate cannot grant bail to an accused unless the case falls in proviso (1) or (2).

In the present case, Id. Counsel for the applicant would argue that the applicant is sick person as shown from the documents obtained from the jail itself. Hence, this court can grant bail to the accused for the said offence also.

I have considered the submissions. I have also perused the copies of the medical documents sent by Id. Counsel with the application. In the documents, the accused is shown to have been suffering with diabetes, hypertension. It is also mentioned in the reports that he has been provided regular medication in the jail and outside the jail in the hospital as and when required. The medical records of the accused no doubt, show that he is suffering with some medical problems. However, he has been provided proper treatment in the jail as available in the records produced by Id. Counsel for the applicant himself. He does not appear to have fallen in the category of sick or infirm mentioned in the first proviso of Section 437 Cr.P.C.

Further, no doubt, the passport of the accused has been seized by the police. However, considering the nature of offence and the facts and circumstances of the case, there are chances that the accused might run away from justice, if he released on bail. India is a vast country. It is

quite easy for a person to become untraceable in the Country if he so wants. An accused might get the desired results if he is able to delay the trial for a substantial period after remaining untraceable for years. Therefore, the submission that the accused is not a flight risk as his passport has been seized by the IO does not have much substance.

I have studied the judgments relied upon by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant. However, they are distinguishable on facts.

I find merits in the submissions of Id. APP. Hence the bail application of accused is dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

Copy be sent to the Id. Counsel for applicant on his E-mail and order be uploaded on the server.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant is directed to file the original bail application along with documents in the court within 2 days from today.

The original record and proceedings be sent back to the Court of Ld. CMM East.

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**DINESH  
KUMAR**

Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:41:02 +05'30'

**IN THE COURT OF ACMM -EAST KKD DELHI**

**State vs. Unknown**

**e-FIR No: 14046/2020**

**PS Kalyan Puri**

**29.10.2020**

**An application for correcting engine number and chassis number in the untrace acceptance report issued by this Court. This application is received on the E-mail ID of the court. The present application has been taken up today through Video Conference according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Applicant absent.

It is mentioned in the application that the untrace report in the abovementioned FIR was accepted by this Court. However, the engine number and the chassis number of the stolen vehicle were wrongly mentioned as 427849 and 075813 respectively. However, the correct engine number and chassis number of the vehicle are 0532919 and 765715. Without these correct particulars the insurance company has refused to process his claim. Hence it is prayed that the necessary correct particulars be mentioned on the report issued by this Court.

Notice of the application was issued to the IO and to the Crime Branch. None has appeared on their behalf.

The untrace reports in e-FIRs of MVT cases are received on the portal of the Delhi Police. Those reports are accepted by the Court. All the particulars are uploaded by the Delhi Police MVT branch. Therefore, it is a mistake on the part of the said agency.

**In these circumstances fresh notice be issued to the Incharge of the concerned branch to explain as to why wrong particulars were filled at the time of uploading the untrace report of the present case on the portal. The reply be filed on the next date of hearing.**

**The concerned incharge shall also join the proceedings in the Court on date fixed.**

**In the meantime it is also directed that the IO of the case shall conduct investigation regarding the correct engine number and chassis number of the stolen vehicle and he shall file his report on next date of hearing.**

**Copy of this order be sent to the concerned incharge, through the IO of the case, and to the IO, for information and compliance.**

Be listed on 24.11.2020.

**DINESH** Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
**KUMAR** Date: 2020.10.29  
16:13:59 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**



**IN THE COURT OF ACMM -EAST KKD DELHI**

**State vs. Unknown**  
**e-FIR No: 43634/2019**  
**PS Kalyan Puri**  
**29.10.2020**

**An application for mentioning engine number and chassis number in the untrace acceptance report issued by this Court. This application is received on the E-mail ID of the court. The present application has been taken up today through Video Conference according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State through VC.

Applicant Devender Kumar absent.

It is mentioned in the application that the untrace report in the abovementioned FIR was accepted by this Court. However, the engine number and the chassis number of the stolen vehicle were not mentioned in the report received by him. Without these particulars the insurance company has refused to process his claim. Hence it is prayed that the necessary particulars be mentioned on the report issued by this Court.

The untrace reports in e-FIRs of MVT cases are received on the portal of the Delhi Police. Those reports are accepted by the Court. All the particulars are uploaded by the Delhi Police MVT branch.

Reports were called from the Incharge of the concerned branch and from the IO of the case for today.

One report is received from the IO. However, no report is received from the crime branch. It is noticed that on earlier occasions also, in various other cases, no reports are received from the crime branch despite service of the notice. It causes inconvenience to the parties.

In these circumstances notice be issued to the DCP Crime branch to

ensure that reports in such cases are filed by the concerned officer in the Court in future within time. Compliance report be filed in the Court on NDOH. One officer not below the rank of Inspector shall also join the proceedings in the Court on NDOH from the crime branch to explain the reasons why the reports are not filed in the Court.

In the meantime notice be also issued to the In-charge of the concerned Crime branch of Delhi Police to explain as to why complete particulars were not filled at the time of uploading the untrace report of the present case on the portal. The reply be filed on the next date of hearing.

In the meantime it is directed that fresh report containing all the particulars be uploaded on the server before next date of hearing to avoid any inconvenience to the applicant.

**Copy of this order be sent to the concerned incharge, through the IO of the case, for information and compliance.**

**The IO shall also join the proceedings on NDOH**

Be listed on 16.11.2020.

**DINESH  
KUMAR**

Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:14:31 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Untrace  
FIR no. 311/2013  
PS New Ashok Nagar

29.10.2020

**An application for untraced report is received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

None for the applicant.

HC Ram Mahender from MACT Cell, East Distt., is present in the court.

He has submitted that in the above-said FIR, an untraced report was prepared which was accepted by the MACT Court on 20.12.2013. He has filed the copy of the said order.

The application stands disposed of.

Copy of the order be supplied to the applicant/counsel.

**DINESH** Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29 16:17:17 +05'30'  
**KUMAR** (DINESH KUMAR)  
ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Upasana Singh  
FIR no. 566/2017  
PS New Ashok Nagar

29.10.2020

**An application for direction to seize the passports of the accused persons received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

None for the applicant.

IO SI Rahul in person through VC.

Status report filed.

Copy of the report be sent on the whatsapp number of the  
ld. Counsel for the applicant mentioned in the vakalatnama.

Be listed for arguments on 03.11.2020.

**DINESH  
KUMAR**

Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:17:54 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)  
ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Hitesh Dhawan  
FIR no. 1614/15  
PS New Ashok Nagar

29.10.2020

**An application for releasing the Driving License of the application on superdari received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Akhil Anand, ld. Counsel for applicant.

The Ahlmad is directed to put up the application with case file on 02.11.2020.

**DINESH**  
**KUMAR**

Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:18:26 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Anupreet Singh Jaggi  
E FIR no. 114/2020  
PS New Ashok Nagar

29.10.2020

**An application for release of Mobile (Redmi Phone) on superdari received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Applicant Deepak and Anupreet Singh Jaggi along with Id counsel Sh. Ravi Ranjan through VC.

Heard on application.

It is stated in the application that Anupreet Singh Jaggi is the rightful owner of the mobile phone. Vide order dated 23.09.2020, this court had allowed the application of the applicant and directed to release the mobile phone of the applicant as per his personal search memo. However, at present, he is residing at Satna, Madhya Pradesh and suffering with various illnesses. Therefore, he has given authority to applicant Deepak to receive his mobile phone from the PS. It is prayed that the necessary order may be passed to release the mobile phone to Deepak, SPA holder of Anupreet Singh Jaggi.

Heard. Record perused.

: 2 :

The application is allowed. The mobile phone of the applicant Anupreet Singh Jaggi be released to his SPA holder Deepak as per law on furnishing an indemnity bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- to the satisfaction of IO/SHO and after verification of the address of the SPA holder.

The application is disposed of.

Record be tagged with the challan.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

Copy be sent to the Id. Defence counsel on his E-mail and order be uploaded on the server.

Ld. Counsel is directed to file the original bail application along with documents in the court within 2 days from today.

**DINESH  
KUMAR**

Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:17:37 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Akbar  
FIR no. 217/2020  
PS Preet Vihar

29.10.2020

**An application for bail u/s 437 Cr.P.C received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Aas Mohd., Id. Counsel for the applicant.  
Reply not received.  
Reply be called from the IO on 02.11.2020.

**DINESH**  
**KUMAR**

Digitally signed  
by DINESH  
KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:18:10 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**



**IN THE COURT OF ACMM-EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Ankit  
E. FIR no. 0266/2020  
PS Preet Vihar  
u/s 379/411/34 IPC

**Application u/s 437 Cr.P.C for grant of bail is received on the E-mail ID of the court. The present application has been taken up today through Video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

**29.10.2020**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Rajan Kumar Prasad, Id. Counsel for the applicant.

HC Manoj from PS Preet Vihar.

Accused is stated to be in JC.

Submissions on bail application heard.

Reply of IO perused.

It is stated by learned counsel for accused/applicant through VC that the accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is in J.C since 13.09.2020. It has been argued by Ld. Counsel for accused that no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the accused/applicant in J/C. Nothing has been recovered from his possession and the alleged recovery has been planted upon the accused. Hence, it is prayed, that accused/applicant may be granted bail.

Ld. APP submits that appropriate order as per law may be passed.

I have heard the submissions and perused the record.

The accused is shown to be in custody since 13.09.2020. His custody is not required for further investigation. This is a period when there is need of decongestion of jails due to COVID-19 Pandemic. Considering the circumstances, nature of offence in question and the age of the accused/applicant, accused/applicant is hereby granted bail on furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount and subject to verification of address of accused as well as his surety, with the following directions : -

1. He shall not change his address without intimation to the Court.
2. He will not try to influence the witnesses.
3. He will not leave the country without prior permission of the court.
4. He will not involve in similar type of offences after releasing on bail. If he is found indulge in similar such type of offences in future, State shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of his bail.

With above directions, bail application of accused stands disposed of. Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent concerned for necessary information and compliance, if any and to supply the copy to the accused.

Copy be sent to the Id. Defence counsel on his E-mail and order be uploaded on the server.

Ld. Counsel is directed to file the original bail application along with documents in the court within 2 days from today.

**DINESH  
KUMAR**

Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:18:48 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Unknown  
FIR no. 26839/2020  
PS New Ashok Nagar

29.10.2020

**An application for release of vehicle no. DL-7S-BX-8230 on superdari received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. S.K. Singh, Id. Counsel for the applicant along with applicant.

Reply received from the IO.

Submission heard. Reply perused.

In view of the judgement of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case of **Manjeet Singh Vs. State Crl. M.C. 4485/2013 and Crl. M.A. No. 16055/2013**, the above said vehicle be released to the applicant on superdari on furnishing indemnity bond in the sum of Rs. 40,000/- (Rs. Forty thousand only) to the satisfaction of the IO. The superdar shall produce the vehicle in court during trial if required

The SHO/IO is further directed to ascertain and satisfy himself about the ownership of the vehicle in question and also to take the photographs of the case property alongwith the negatives duly

authenticated and certified and a detailed punchanama be also prepared of the property before such release. It is also directed that the investigating officer shall keep on record the permanent address of the applicant, his/her identity proof, his/her address proof as well as his/her phone number. It is further directed that the applicant shall join the investigation/trial as and when directed to do so and will also undertake that he/she will intimate to the court and address which he/she may change during the course of time.

Photographs shall be placed on record alongwith the Negative/CD. If the photographs are taken from digital camera, there is no need to place negatives on record.

Applicant shall be at liberty to dispose off the case property.

The documents of the property which are found genuine during investigation be also released to the rightful claimant. Application is disposed off accordingly. Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant.

Copy be sent to the Id. Defence counsel on his E-mail and order be uploaded on the server.

Ld. Counsel is directed to file the original bail application along with documents in the court within 2 days from today.

**DINESH  
KUMAR** Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
Date: 2020.10.29  
16:19:15 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Unknown  
E FIR no. 035544/2017  
PS New Ashok Nagar

29.10.2020

**An application for release of vehicle no. DL-11SK-2256 on superdari received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Anil Payal, Id. Counsel for applicant Insurance company.

Applicant is the Insurance company.

The IO is directed to conduct an inquiry from the registered owner of the vehicle and to submit a report whether the registered owner has received the insurance money from the company.

Report be filed on 06.11.2020.

**DINESH** Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
**KUMAR** Date: 2020.10.29  
16:19:33 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Shahjad  
FIR no. 46185/2028  
PS New Ashok Nagar

29.10.2020

**An application for release of RC of vehicle no. DL-5S-AZ-3765 on superdari received on the E-mail ID of the court. This application has been taken up today through video conferencing according to the Office Order no. 417/RG/DHC/2020 dated the Delhi, 27.08.2020, issued by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Order no. 5576-94/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/Delhi dated 29.08.2020 as well as Order no. 5357-5377/JUDL.BR./East/KKD/ Delhi dated 28.09.2020 issued by Ld. Distt. & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

None for the applicant.

Be put up with the case file on 07.11.2020.

**DINESH** Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR  
**KUMAR** Date: 2020.10.29  
16:19:51 +05'30'

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF A.C.M.M. -EAST KKD DELHI**

State vs. Thakur Prasad  
FIR no. 272/2020  
PS New Ashok Nagar

28.10.2020

**Case file is taken up again along with application for release of DL, on the oral request of Sh. Jain Saab, ld counsel for the applicant.**

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Jain Saab, ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Heard.

Vide order dated 28.10.2020, the application for release of DL was allowed and applicant was permitted to take the DL. However, inadvertently, it was mentioned that DL was release on superdari.

Perusal of the record shows that vide order dated 20.09.2020, the case has already been decided and the file was consigned to Record Room. Therefore, order is modified accordingly. DL of the applicant be released to applicant.

This file be consigned to Record Room.

**(DINESH KUMAR)**  
**ACMM (EAST)/KKD/29.10.2020**