

State vs. Amit  
FIR No. 22/2021  
Us 356/379/411 IPC  
PS Gandhi Nagar

08.02.2021

Present : Substitute APP for the State.  
Sh. Ankit, counsel for applicant Guru Pal.  
IO/ ASI Pawan Kumar.

This is an application for releasing of mobile phone "Samsung Galaxy M-21, IMEI No.356059115022721" on superdari in favour of applicant Guru Pal.

Reply to application is filed by the IO/ASI Pawan Kumar. As per reply, IO has no objection if the mobile phone is released to rightful owner. Heard. Application perused.

Having considered all the relevant inputs, report of the IO and in view of judgments in **Manjeet Singh v. State**, I am satisfied that this will be an eminently fit case where the above stated mobile phone can be released to rightful owner, subject to execution of security bond. Accordingly, let the above said mobile phone be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of above said mobile phone; valuation report and a security bond.

**The photographs of the case property should be attested by the IO and countersigned by the complainant, accused, if any, as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.**

The panchnama/ photographs/ valuation report etc. be filed along with charge sheet. IO is also directed to follow the necessary safeguards insisted in **Manjeet Singh v. State**.

The **application stand disposed of** accordingly. Copy of this order be given *dasti* to the applicant and IO as well.

  
(ANSHUL MEHTA)  
MM (East)/KKD Courts/Delhi  
08.02.2021

State vs. Vinod Jha  
FIR No. 70/2020  
U/s 420/384 IPC  
PS Mayur Vihar Phase-1

08.02.2021

Present : Sh. Vinod Kumar Yadav, substitute APP for State.  
Sh. Pradeep Kumar, counsel for complainant.  
Sh. Vivek Sharma, counsel for applicant/ accused.

An application U/Sec. 437 Cr.P.C. for the release of the accused Vinod Jha, is moved by his Counsel.

Reply of the IO received.

Both the sides are heard on the application.

Considering the following :

- 1). that the allegations are very grievous in nature and involves a huge amount of more than Rs. One Crores.
- 2). that the investigation is at initial stage.
- 3). that as per the report of the IO, out of above said amount, an amount of Rs.23 lakhs was received in the bank account of the applicant from the Pay'm account of the complainant.
- 4). that the Court finds no reason as to why even after receiving such huge amount, the applicant did not report the same to the bank or any other authority.

In view of above, the present **application is dismissed.**

Copy of the order be given dasti on request.

Application is disposed off accordingly.

  
(ANSHUL MEHTA)  
MM (East)/KKD Courts/Delhi  
08.02.2021

State vs. Unknown  
FIR No. 483/2020  
Us 279/337 IPC  
PS Mayur Vihar

08.02.2021

Present : Substitute APP for the State.  
Sh. Rahul Tomar, counsel for applicant/ complainant Prince Kr.  
IO/ ASI Rakesh Singh.

This is an application moved on behalf of the complainant Prince Kumar for release of motorcycle bearing no. DL3SCF-8267.

Heard. IO states that the said vehicle has already been released on Superdari to applicant in this case.

At this stage, learned counsel for applicant seeks permission to withdraw the present application. In view of the request made, present **application stands disposed off as withdrawn.**

  
(ANSHUL MEHTA)  
MM (East)/KKD Courts/Delhi  
08.02.2021