

FIR No. 347/18
PS Welcome
U/s 302 IPC
State Vs. Abdul Latif

29.04.2020

Present: Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. R.K. Kochhar, Ld. Counsel for accused. (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. Reply received from Deputy Superintendent, Jail No. 12, Mandoli along with report of Medical Officer Incharge.
3. As per the medical status report prepared by Medical Officer Incharge, the accused / applicant is a known case of diabetes, hypertension, cataract, hepatitis B and vitiligo.
4. Ld. Counsel for the accused has specifically submitted that the accused / applicant is HIV positive, however, no such fact is mentioned in the report. Ld. Counsel request to call for a report specifically in this regard.
5. Accordingly, let a report be called from Jail Superintendent specifically as to whether the accused is HIV positive or not.
6. Put up for report on 01.05.2020.
7. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms

of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated
20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara
District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)

Judge on Duty

PO-MACT/SHD/KKD

29.04.2020

FIR No. 58/20
PS Jyoti Nagar
U/s 147/148/149/457/427/436 IPC
State Vs. Akram, S/o Munna Khan

29.04.2020

Present: Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. Vikas Gautam, Ld. Counsel for accused (through video conferencing)
IO SHO Shailender Kumar, PS Jyoti Nagar (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is first bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to accused / applicant who was arrested in the aforesaid FIR on 07.04.2020. In the bail application, it is submitted that the accused has old parents and that he is the only earning member in the family. It is further stated in the application that the accused has been falsely implicated by the police officials of PS Jyoti Nagar in the present FIR and even otherwise the investigation is complete and no purpose would be served by detaining the accused in custody.
3. In reply to the bail application, it is stated that the accused was arrested on 07.04.2020 on the pointing out of his associate Aamir, S/o Abrar and that he was also seen in CCTV footage of the spot of crime which was seized by the IO.

4. In view of the fact that the mob of which the accused was a part was equipped with latthis / rods as well as kerosene / petrol bottles. Further, in view of the fact that the investigation is at initial stage and that the accused is seen in the CCTV footage seized by the IO, in the opinion of the court, the accused is not entitled to bail at this stage as charge sheet is yet to be filed.
5. Bail application is dismissed at this stage.
6. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER
(SHUCHI LALER)
Judge on Duty
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No. 49/20
PS Anand Vihar
U/s 304A IPC
7, 9 Prohibition of Employment as Manual Scavengers and Rehabilitation Act,
2013
3 (1) J of SC / ST Act
State Vs. Amit Giri@Mahender Giri

29.04.2020

(Bail application has been directly received from Jail).

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh Gaurav, Ld LAC for accused (through video conferencing)
IO ACP Mayank Bansal (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of interim bail of 45 days received from jail, through jail superintendent.
3. In the application it is stated that the accused / applicant is in custody since 22.02.2020 and is permanent resident of Mayur Vihar, Phase - III, Delhi Interim bail is sought in view of the orders passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in W.P. (C) No. 1/2020, by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. (C) No. 2945/2020 and the directions issued by the Hon'ble High Powered Committee in the meetings held on 28.03.2020 and 07.04.2020.

4. This application was listed twice earlier on 25.04.2020 and 27.04.2020 and on 27.04.2020, it was categorically observed by Ld. ASJ that “offences alleged against the applicant are punishable with imprisonment for a period upto five years”.
5. In view of the orders passed by Hon’ble Apex Court and Hon’ble High Court in the aforesaid Writ Petitions and in view of the directions issued by the Hon’ble High Powered Committee, as mentioned above, in the opinion of the court, the present accused is entitled to interim bail for 45 days upon furnishing of personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- to the satisfaction of jail superintendent subject to the condition that the accused shall join investigation as and when called upon and he shall attend the court on each and every date of hearing.
6. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No. 508/19
PS Anand Vihar
U/s 506 IPC and Section 6 of POCSO Act
State Vs. Amit Kumar Sharma

29.04.2020

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. V.K. Updhyay, Ld. Counsel for accused / applicant (through video conferencing)
IO ASI Neelam (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. During the course of arguments it has been submitted that charge sheet in the instant matter has already been filed.
3. Ld. APP for the State submitted that without going through the charge sheet it is difficult to assess the evidence against the accused and to address arguments on the bail application. He requests the matter be listed before the concerned court after the lockdown.
4. Ld Counsel for the accused has also acceded that the instant matter be listed on 5.5.2020.
5. In absence of the charge sheet it is difficult to decide the present application on merits. Accordingly, the same be listed before the concerned court on 05.05.2020.

6. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
Judge on Duty
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No. 93/2020
PS Welcome
U/s 143/144/147/148/149/323/307 IPC and 27 Arms Act.
State Vs. Anees Ahmad

29.04.2020

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. Vikas Gautam, Ld. Counsel for accused / applicant (through video conferencing)
IO SI Himanshu (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is first bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to accused / applicant who was arrested on 11.04.2020 in the aforesaid FIR and sent to JC on 12.04.2020.
3. In the application it is submitted that the accused is 72 years of age and suffering from Asthma and old age ailments. It is stated in the application that nothing was recovered from the accused and after the arrest of the accused no application for police custody was moved by the IO. It is further stated that prosecution case is false and concocted and the accused was not involved in any offence as alleged.
4. During the course of arguments Id. Counsel submitted that accused was not present at the spot and that there is no video footage to establish his presence.

5. In the reply to the bail application, it is submitted that the role of the accused is also being investigated in the other cases of rioting in the area as about 700 cases were registered with respect to various rioting incidents that took place around the area. It is also submitted in the reply that the accused if released on bail may threaten the witnesses and may disturb peace and harmony and that the accused is involved in anti national activities.
6. When the IO was specifically asked about as to how the accused was identified as he was not named in the FIR, the IO intimated that the accused was identified by complainant ASI Dharambir Singh and he stated that as of now there is no video footage in which the presence of the accused would be found.
7. Further, upon inquiry the IO submitted that there is no previous involvement of the accused and no recovery has been made from him.
8. Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application on the ground that the accused is involved in heinous offence and was part of the unlawful assembly, the members of which committed offence under Section 307 IPC as well. He submitted that the common object of the unlawful assembly makes the present accused liable for offence under Section 307 IPC besides other offences.
9. Ld. Counsel for the accused further submitted that co-accused Junedh was admitted to bail by Id. Sessions Court in March, 2020 in the same matter and that the accused was also compensated as a victim by Delhi Government.
10. In view of the fact that the accused is 72 years old, no previous involvement of the accused is reported, the accused belongs to poor family, no CCTV footage was found showing his presence at the spot and the only role attributed to him is that he was pelting stones, the

accused / applicant, namely, Anees Ahmad is admitted to bail upon furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- and a surety in like amount subject to the condition that he shall not leave the country without permission of the court, he shall not change his address without intimating the court, he shall join investigation as and when called upon and he shall attend the court on each and every date of hearing.

11. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
Judge on Duty
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No.188/19
PS Harsh Vihar
U/s 498A/304B/34 IPC
State Vs. Deepak Shukla

29.04.2020

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. S.K. Tiwari, Ld. Counsel for accused / applicant (through video conferencing)
IO SI Rajiv Kumar (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is a bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of interim bail to accused / applicant for a period of 3 months who was sent to JC on 01.05.2019.
3. The present application is moved for interim bail in view of the directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble Delhi High Court.
4. During the course of arguments, Id. Counsel for the accused admitted that the case of the accused / applicant does not fall within the ambit of the orders passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in W.P. (C) No. 1/2020, by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. (C) No. 2945/2020 and the directions issued by the High Powered Committee in the meetings held on 28.03.2020 and 07.04.2020.

5. Ld. Counsel prays to withdraw the present application with liberty to file afresh on merits.
6. Application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh.
7. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.


SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
Judge on Duty
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No. 155/2020
PS Welcome
U/s 323/506 IPC and 10/21 of POCSO Act
State Vs. Faizan

29.04.2020

Bail application directly received from Jail.

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing).

Sh Gaurav, LAC for accused (through Video Conferencing)

IO SI Amit Kumar (through video conferencing).

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of interim bail of 45 days received from jail, through jail superintendent.
3. In the application it is submitted that the accused / applicant is in custody since 27.03.2020 and he is permanent resident of Janta Colony, Delhi. Interim bail is sought in view of the orders passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in W.P. (C) No. 1/2020, by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. (C) No. 2945/2020 and the directions issued by the High Powered Committee in the meetings held on 28.03.2020 and 07.04.2020.
4. On the last date of hearing i.e. 27.04.2020, the IO stated before Ld. ASJ that Section 6 of POCSO Act was deleted, in view of which a detailed reply was sought from the IO.

5. Today, the IO has appeared through video conferencing and filed a detailed reply in the matter in which he has categorically stated that *“From the statement under Section 164 Cr.PC the victim, no offence has been committed by the accused. The accused has no previous involvement.”*
6. The court has perused statement under Section 164 Cr.PC dated 11.04.2020 recorded by Ld. MM wherein Ld. MM has categorically asked the victim as to whether the accused / applicant committed any act upon the victim to which the victim replied that the accused / applicant did not do anything.
7. In view of the reply to the bail application and the statement under Section 164 Cr.PC dated 11.04.2020, in opinion of the court, the accused is entitled to bail. Though the application is for interim bail, however, in view of the statement under Section 164 Cr.PC dated 11.04.2020, the accused is admitted to regular bail upon furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- to the satisfaction of jail superintendent subject to the condition that the accused shall join investigation as and when called upon and he shall attend the court on each and every date of hearing.
8. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No. 94/2020
PS Jagat Puri
U/s 376 IPC
State Vs. Kulwinder Singh Sahini@Ranjan

29.04.2020

Present: Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. Gaurav Malhotra, Ld. Counsel for accused (through video conferencing)
IO SI Shivani Katyar (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is first bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the accused.
3. As the offence alleged is under Section 376 IPC, hence, notice of the application be issued to complainant through IO with direction to the complainant to join the bail proceedings through video conferencing on webex.
4. Ld. APP for the State has also submitted that he did not receive the copy of application. Let copy of the application be supplied to Ld. APP for the State.
5. Put up for arguments on 30.04.2020.
6. IO to also join bail proceedings on video conferencing through webex.
7. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms

of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated
20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara
District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)

Judge on Duty

PO-MACT/SHD/KKD

29.04.2020

FIR No. 93/2020
PS Welcome
U/s 143/144/147/148/149/323/307 IPC and 27 Arms Act.
State Vs. Mohd. Asif

29.04.2020

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. Abdul Salam, Ld. Counsel for accused / applicant (through video conferencing)
IO SI Himanshu (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is first bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to accused / applicant who was arrested on 08.03.2020 in the aforesaid FIR and sent to JC on 09.03.2020.
3. In the application it is mentioned that the accused is not named in the FIR, the IO has failed to trace any eye witness for the identification of the accused and there is no footage of the accused so as to establish his involvement in the offences alleged in the FIR. It is further submitted that the accused along with his family at the time of incident had gone to the house of his Khala which is approximately one kilometer from the house of accused and he remained there till the situation outside became normal. Lastly, it is submitted that the accused is married person having two minor daughters aged around 3 years and 6 months only and he also takes

care of his father and mother who are ill and receiving treatment at Rajiv Gandhi Hospital and from Dr. Geeta Gupta respectively.

4. During the course of arguments Id. Counsel submitted that accused was not present at the spot and that there is no video footage to establish his presence.
5. In the reply to the bail application, it is submitted that the accused / applicant is a close associate of accused Samim and the role of the accused is also being investigated in the other cases of rioting in the area as about 700 cases were registered with respect to various rioting incidents that took place around the area. It is also submitted in the reply that the accused if released on bail he may threaten the witnesses and may disturb peace and harmony as the accused is involved in anti national activities.
6. When the IO was specifically asked about as to how the accused was identified as he was not named in the FIR, the IO informed that the accused was identified by one witness, namely, HC Mahipal and he stated that as of now there is no video footage in which the presence of the accused could be found.
7. The court has gone through the statement under Section 161 Cr.PC of HC Mahipal dated 08.03.2020 in which on page no. 2 he has mentioned that the accused was found handing over wooden sticks to other persons during the riots. Besides the said role of the accused in the riots, no other role has been attributed to him during the course of investigation, despite the fact that the accused is in custody since 08.03.2020 i.e. for about 1 month and 20 days.
8. Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application on the ground that the accused is involved in heinous offence and was part of the unlawful assembly, the members of which committed offence under Section 307 IPC as well. He submitted that the common object of

the unlawful assembly makes the present accused liable for offence under Section 307 IPC besides other offences.

9. In view of the fact that the accused is in custody for more than 50 days, no previous involvement of the accused is reported, the accused belongs to poor family having small children who need to be taken care of, no CCTV footage was found showing his presence at the spot and the only role attributed to him is that he gave wooden sticks / dands to the rioters, the accused / applicant, namely, Mohd. Asif is admitted to bail upon furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- and a surety in like amount subject to the condition that he shall not leave the country without permission of the court, he shall not change his address without intimating the court, he shall join investigation as and when called upon and he shall attend the court on each and every date of hearing.
10. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
Judge on Duty
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No. 541/2017
PS Farsh Bazar
U/s 307/186/353/34/120B IPC and 25/27 Arms Act.
State Vs. Monu@Pawan, S/o Rishi

29.04.2020

Present: Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. J.P. Bansal, Ld. Counsel for accused (through video conferencing)
IO ASI Ashok (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is first bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the accused / applicant who was sent to JC on 30.11.2017.
3. During the course of arguments, it has been submitted that the charge sheet in the present case has already been filed and Id. Counsel for accused stated that he wants to withdraw the present application with liberty to file an application for interim bail. In view

of the request, the application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh.

4. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)

Judge on Duty

PO-MACT/SHD/KKD

29.04.2020

FIR No. 69/2020
PS Seemapuri
U/s 307/332/353/394/395/186/147/148/152/412/34 IPC
State Vs. Rafiq

29.04.2020

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)

None for accused / applicant.

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. In view of order dated 27.04.2020 of Ld. ASJ, report received from Deputy Superintendent, Jail No. 13, Mandoli, Delhi regarding previous involvement of the accused and as per the said report there is no other case pending against UTP / applicant Rafiq.
3. Previous involvement report of the accused from the Investigating Officer also needs to be called to verify his previous involvement.
4. Let Previous Involvement Report be called from the IO for the next date of hearing i.e. 30.04.2020 and IO is also directed to join the bail proceedings through video conferencing on Webex.
5. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)

Judge on Duty

PO-MACT/SHD/KKD

29.04.2020

FIR No. 5/2020
PS Nand Nagari
U/s 307/34 IPC
State Vs. Rahul, S/o Hari Babu

29.04.2020

Present: Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Ms. Anita Dhingra, Ld. Counsel for accused (through video conferencing)
IO SI Bintu Sharma (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is first bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the accused / applicant who was sent to JC on 02.01.2020.
3. During the course of arguments, it has been submitted that the charge sheet in the present case has already been filed and Id. Counsel for accused stated that she wants to withdraw the present application with liberty to file an application for interim bail. In view of the request, the application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh.
4. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the

A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)

Judge on Duty

PO-MACT/SHD/KKD

29.04.2020

FIR No. 08/20
PS Crime Branch
U/s 21 / 25 NDPS Act.
State Vs. Rocky

29.04.2020

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. Mohd. Zahid, Ld. Counsel for accused / applicant (through video conferencing)
IO ASI Subhash Chand (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.

2. This is a bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of interim bail for a period of 3 months to accused / applicant who was arrested on 14.01.2020 in the aforesaid FIR.

3. In the application it is submitted that the application is filed in view of spread of covid – 19 and due to death of maternal aunt of the applicant. It is also submitted in the application that even on earlier occasion the accused was admitted to interim bail at the time of delivery of his child and at the time of marriage of his relative.

4. In the reply to the bail application, it is submitted that the accused was found in possession of 375 gms. of heroine hidden in the handle of his motorcycle on 13.01.2020 and his motorcycle was also seized. In the reply, it is further submitted that the applicant's maternal aunt expired on 19.04.2020 and the applicant's wife is a young lady of sound health who does not require an elder lady to take care of her. It is also stated in the reply that the applicant availed of the benefit of interim bail twice i.e. 7 days in the month of February,

2020 and 10 days in the month of March, 2020. Lastly, in the reply it is stated that the accused has concealed that he is previously involved in another case of NDPS in FIR No. 746/17, PS Nand Nagari. It is also stated that the mother of the applicant, namely, Bharati is also involved in sale of narcotics substances and at presently she is in judicial custody.

6. In view of the past involvement of the accused and further in view of the fact that presently there is no urgency for want of interim bail and that the case of the accused does not fall within the directions issued by the High Powered Committee and that rather the case is under NDPS Act which has been specifically excluded in the directions issued by the High Powered Committee, in the opinion of the court, no ground for interim bail is made out and the bail application is accordingly, dismissed at this stage.

7. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
Judge on Duty
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020

FIR No. 622/19
PS Jafrabad
U/s 377 IPC and Section 6 POCSO Act.
State Vs. Shakir@Monty

29.04.2020

Present: Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)

Sh. Mohd. Shamim, Ld. Counsel for accused. (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is an application seeking interim bail for a period of 50 days.
3. During the course of arguments, Id. Counsel for accused has submitted that he wishes to file documents of illness of father of the accused / applicant. Let the same be filed today and documents be verified for 01.05.2020.
4. Matter be listed on 01.05.2020.
5. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)

Judge on Duty

PO-MACT/SHD/KKD

29.04.2020

FIR No. 93/20
PS Welcome
U/s 143/144/147/148/149/323/307 IPC and 27 Arms Act.
State Vs. Sher Miyan@Shibbo

29.04.2020

Present:- Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State. (through video conferencing)
Sh. Vikas Gautam, Ld. Counsel for accused / applicant (through video conferencing)
IO SI Himanshu (through video conferencing)

1. In view of the office order no. 2155-2175/Judl./SHD/2020, dated 15.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi issued in wake of corona virus pandemic (covid – 19), the present application has been put up before the undersigned and heard through video conferencing using Cisco Webex Application.
2. This is first bail application under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to accused / applicant who was arrested on 19.03.2020 in the aforesaid FIR.
3. In the application it is submitted that the accused has old parents and he is only earning member in his family, who can arrange food or essential items for his family members. It is stated that the entire prosecution case is concocted and that no recovery of any sought was made from the present accused.
4. During the course of arguments Id. Counsel submitted that accused was not present at the spot and that there is no evidence to establish his presence.

5. In the reply to the bail application, it is submitted that the accused / applicant is a close associate of other accused persons and the role of the accused is also being investigated in the other cases of rioting in the area as about 700 cases were registered with respect to various rioting incidents that took place around the area. It is also submitted in the reply that the accused if released on bail may threaten the witnesses and may disturb peace and harmony and that accused is involved in anti national activities.
6. In the reply it is specifically stated that the present accused was identified and arrested on 19.03.2020 on the basis of the CCTV footage and the said CCTV footage has also been shown to the court.
7. Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application on the ground that the accused is involved in heinous offence and was part of the unlawful assembly, the members of which committed offence under Section 307 IPC as well. He submitted that the common object of the unlawful assembly makes the present accused liable for offence under Section 307 IPC besides other offences. He further submitted that the CCTV footage clearly shows the involvement of the accused in the offences alleged in the FIR.
8. The court has seen the CCTV footage on the basis of which the accused was identified and arrested on 19.03.2020. There is strong electronic evidence to prove the involvement of the accused in the offences alleged and there is strong apprehension that if the accused is released on bail he may again indulge in such activities and may also abscond. Accordingly, in view of the CCTV footage which is a strong piece of evidence against the accused, as the investigation is at initial stage and the charge sheet has yet not been filed, the bail application of the accused is dismissed at this stage.

9. Copy of the order be sent to the Computer Branch for uploading the same on the website. Copy of the order be also sent to the A.O. (Judicial), who shall supply the same to the parties in terms of office order no. 2204-2221/D&SJ SHD/KKD/Delhi dated 20.04.2020 of the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

SHUCHI LALER

(SHUCHI LALER)
Judge on Duty
PO-MACT/SHD/KKD
29.04.2020