

**Bail Application:- Surender @ Happy s/o Charanjeet**  
**FIR No. 185/20**  
**PS North Rohini**  
**State vs. Surender @ Happy**  
**U/s. 186/353/332/482 IPC & 25/54/59 Arms Act**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Ramesh Chander, Ld. Counsel for the accused (through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application u/s 437 Cr. P. C seeking bail has been moved on behalf of the accused stating that he is in JC since 15.04.2020 and he has been falsely implicated in the matter. Moreover, it is alleged that the recovery of illegal weapon shown from the accused is planted upon him. It is pointed out that the investigation qua the accused is complete and he is no more required to be detained in judicial custody. Ld. Counsel for the applicant prayed that the accused be enlarged on bail.

Reply filed by the IO perused. Submissions of the Ld. APP for the State heard. Both the IO and the Ld. APP have vehemently opposed the bail application pointing out that the offence complained of is serious in nature and the accused is a habitual offender who may commit a similar offence in future in case he is admitted to bail. The Ld. APP stated that the application deserves to be dismissed.

Having cogitated over the rival submissions and upon perusal of material before me it is evident that the accused committed various offences under the IPC and Arms Act on 14.04.2020. The previous involvement report filed by the IO shows that the accused is involved in various other criminal cases. The accused is not entitled to discretionary relief of bail as there is every likelihood that upon release the accused may again get involved in criminal activities, accordingly, the present bail application is hereby dismissed being devoid of merit.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**ANURAG THAKUR**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**Bail Application:- Abhey Yadav s/o Late Ram Dayal**  
**FIR No. 1374/17**  
**PS Aman Vihar**  
**State vs. Abhey Yadav**  
**U/s. 420/467/468/471/34 IPC**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Ashish Loria, ld. Counsel for the applicant (through V.C.).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

Reply to the bail application has been filed by IO SI P. L. Meena, PS Aman Vihar.

Application for grant of regular bail U/s. 437 Cr. P.C. to accused Abhey Yadav as well as the reply to the application filed by the IO perused.

Submissions of the ld. APP as well as ld. counsel for the applicant heard.

The FIR in the present matter is lodged for offences u/s 420/467/468/471/34 IPC. One of the punishments prescribed for the commission of the offence U/s. 467 IPC is imprisonment for life. From the perusal of material available on record it cannot be stated with certitude that Abhey Yadav is not involved in commission of offence u/s 467 IPC i.e. forgery of valuable security, will, etc. In fact from the reply filed by the IO, it seems that Abhey Yadav was hand in glove with accused Kuldeep and he received part of the proceeds of sale of plot sold by the accused persons by preparing forged document.

Hence, the bar contained in Section 437 (1) Cr. P.C. comes into operation to the effect that this Court is not competent to hear and dispose off the present bail application. Accordingly, present bail application is hereby dismissed in *limine*.

Ld. counsel for accused/applicant is at liberty to approach the appropriate forum for seeking bail for accused Abhey Yadav.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**ANURAG THAKUR**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**Bail Application:- Lalit Chouhan s/o Subhash Chouhan**  
**FIR No. 000228/20**  
**PS Budh Vihar**  
**State vs. Lalit Chouhan**  
**U/s. 454/380/411/34 IPC**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Brajesh Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused  
(through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application u/s 437 Cr. P. C has been moved on behalf of the accused stating that he is in JC since 21.03.2020. It is claimed in the application that the accused has been falsely implicated in the matter and the co-accused in the matter have already been admitted to bail. The Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that the investigation qua accused is complete and he is no more required to be detained in judicial custody. He prayed that the accused be enlarged on bail.

Reply filed by the IO perused. Submissions of the Ld. APP for the State heard. Both the IO and the Ld. APP have vehemently opposed the bail application pointing out that the offence complained of is serious in nature and the accused was identified and apprehended on the basis of CCTV footage of the incident. The Ld. APP stated that the accused may commit a similar offence in future in case he is released from custody. Ld. APP argued that the application deserves to be dismissed.

Having cogitated over the rival submissions and upon perusal of material before me it is evident that the recovery of the stolen case property has already been made, the co-accused are reportedly on bail and moreover, the accused has clean antecedents. There is hardly any chance that upon release on bail the accused will tamper with evidence or threaten the witnesses, accordingly, the present application is allowed to the effect that the accused is admitted to bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in like amount to the satisfaction of the MM/Duty MM/Jail Duty MM.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**Bail Application:- Ramesh Paswan s/o Lachhi Ram**  
**FIR No. 193/20**  
**PS Ashok Vihar**  
**State vs. Ramesh Paswan**  
**U/s. 33/38 Delhi Excise Act**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Udai Pratap Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused  
(through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application u/s 437 Cr. P. C has been moved on behalf of the accused stating that he is in JC since 21.04.2020. It is claimed in the application that the accused has been falsely implicated in the matter and mother-in-law of the accused is seriously ill. The Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that the investigation qua accused is complete and he is no more required to be detained in judicial custody. He prayed that the accused be enlarged on bail.

Reply filed by the IO perused. Submissions of the ld. APP for the State heard. Both the IO and the ld. APP have vehemently opposed the bail application pointing out that the offence complained of is serious in nature. The Ld. APP stated that the accused has criminal antecedents and he may commit a similar offence in future in case he is released from custody. Ld. APP argued that the application deserves to be dismissed.

Having cogitated over the rival submissions and upon perusal of material before me it is evident that the recovery of illicit liquor has already been made, the investigation qua accused is complete and there is hardly any chance that upon release on bail the accused will tamper with evidence or threaten the witnesses, accordingly, the present application is allowed to the effect that the accused is admitted to bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in like amount to the satisfaction of the MM/Duty MM/Jail Duty MM.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**Bail Application:- Amit Kumar s/o Ram Sagar**  
**FIR No. 259/19**  
**PS Ashok Vihar**  
**State vs. Amit Kumar**  
**U/s. 356/379/411/34 IPC**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Vikas Gautam, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused  
(through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application u/s 437 Cr. P. C for grant of interim bail has been moved on behalf of the accused stating that he is in JC since 10.10.2019. It is claimed in the application that the accused has been falsely implicated in the matter and he had already been admitted to regular bail but he could not furnish the surety bond so he is languishing in jail. It is prayed in the application that the accused be released on interim bail for a period of 45 days on furnishing of personal bond only.

Reply filed by the IO perused. Submissions of the Ld. APP for the State heard. The IO in his reply mentioned that the accused was granted bail by the concerned court and the chargesheet in the matter has already been filed. Ld. APP submitted that the present application be dismissed and the accused shall not be released on his furnishing only a personal bond.

The IO or the defence counsel have not been able to produce the copy of order granting bail to the accused. They are unable to tell even the date of passing of that order. Hence, in the absence of bail order as well as the date of passing of the bail order, it cannot be stated with certitude 'what were the conditions imposed at the time of passing of that order. Taking into consideration the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the accused is admitted to interim bail for a period of 45 days to be computed from the date of his release on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- only to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent concerned.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent forthwith for information and compliance.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**Bail Application:- Mohit @ Deepak s/o Mukesh Bhardwaj**  
**FIR No. 299/2019**  
**PS North Rohini**  
**State vs. Mohit @ Deepak**  
**U/s. 379/356/411/34 IPC**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Joginder Tuli, Ld. Counsel for the accused (through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application for being released on furnishing of personal bond only has been moved by the Learned Counsel for the accused Mohit @ Deepak stating that in the present case the accused was ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond but he could not produce a surety and is still languishing in jail. It is pointed out that in Writ Petition (Criminal 779/2020 in “ Court on its own Motion vs. State”. The Delhi High Court vide an order dated 09.04.2020 obviated the requirement of furnishing surety bond and hence, the accused be released on furnishing of personal bond only.

Reply to the application filed by IO ASI Ramesh wherein the submissions made in the application have been confirmed. Importantly, the copy of bail order passed by the Ld. MM concerned is neither attached with the application nor the same has been filed by the IO with the reply.

To decide the application efficaciously, it is imperative that the copy of bail order shall be brought on record. Hence, let the Ahlmad of the court having jurisdiction over PS North Rohini be called to appear in person with the bail order, if any, regarding accused Mohit @ Deepak passed in the aforementioned case: on **04.05.2020.**

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**ANURAG THAKUR**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**e-FIR No. 05179/19**  
**PS Bharat Nagar**  
**State vs. Sunil s/o Rewati Prasad**  
**U/s. 379/411/34 IPC**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Ravinder Dabas, Ld. Counsel for the accused (through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

Reply to the application seeking status report filed by SI Anand Singh. Let a reply be called from the concerned Jail Superintendent wherein the Jail Superintendent shall clearly specify the details of cases in which the accused is in judicial custody: on **04.05.2020**.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**ANURAG THAKUR**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**e-FIR No. 05179/19**  
**PS Bharat Nagar**  
**State vs. Shanu s/o Mohd. Nawab**  
**U/s. 379/411/34 IPC**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Ravinder Dabas, Ld. Counsel for the accused (through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

Reply to the application seeking status report filed by SI Anand Singh. Let a reply be called from the concerned Jail Superintendent wherein the Jail Superintendent shall clearly specify the details of cases in which the accused is in judicial custody: on **04.05.2020**.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**ANURAG THAKUR**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**



**e-FIR No. 689/2019**  
**PS Bharat Nagar**  
**State vs. Amit Kumar s/o Ram Sagar**  
**U/s. 379/411 IPC**

02.05.2020

Present:- Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Vikas Gautam, Ld. Counsel for the accused (through VC).

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

Reply to the application seeking bail not filed by the IO. Let a notice be sent to the IO directing him to file a reply to the bail application on **04.05.2020**.

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**ANURAG THAKUR**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**FIR No.111/20**  
**PS: Budh Vihar**  
**State Vs Sohan**  
**U/s.188/269/279 IPC**  
**Vehicle No. (DL 4C AY 9098)**

**02.05.2020**

**Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing**

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.  
Sh. Gaurav Vats, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID -19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

The matter is taken up on an oral request of ld. Counsel for the applicant wherein he submitted that in the superdari order dated 01.05.2020, the vehicle no. was mentioned as DL 4C AY CF 9098 whereas the correct vehicle no. is DL 4C AY 9098. He requested that the necessary correction/modification be made in the order dated 01.05.2020.

During hearing, it is pointed out to the ld. Counsel that the vehicle no. mentioned in the heading of the application moved by him was incorrect which eventually lead to the aforementioned error. It is impressed upon the counsel to be careful in future. The order of superdari dated 01.05.2020 is hereby modified as follows:-

An application has been filed by the applicant/ owner for release of Vehicle No.DL-4CAY-9098 on superdari. Reply has been filed by IO/HC Tribhuwan Jha from PS Budh Vihar and submitted that there is no objection for the release of the aforesaid article to the owner. Heard.

**Let the vehicle be released to its rightful owner subject to production original documents.**

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed in *Manjit Singh Vs. State CRL. M.C.4485/2013 and CRL.M.A. NO. 16055/2013 decided on 10.09.2014* as follows:  
“Valuable articles

:2:

1. *The valuable articles seized by the police may be released to the person, who, in the opinion of the Court, is lawfully entitled to claim such as the complainant at whose house theft, robbery or dacoity has taken place, after preparing detailed panchnama of such articles; taking photographs of such articles and a security bond.*
2. *The photographs of such articles should be attested or countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over. Wherever necessary, the Court may get the jewelery articles valued from a government approved valuer.*
3. *The actual production of the valuable articles during the trial should not be insisted upon and the photographs along with the panchnama should suffice for the purposes of evidence.*
4. *Where such articles are not handed over either to the complainant or to the person from whom such articles were seized or to its claimant, then the Court may direct that such articles be kept in a locker.*
5. *If required, the Court may direct that such articles be handed back to the Investigating Officer for further investigation and identification. However, in no circumstance, the Investigating Officer should keep such articles in custody for a longer period for the purposes of investigation and identification.*
6. *If articles are required to be kept in police custody, the SHO shall, after preparing proper panchnama, keep such articles in a locker.*

In these circumstances the aforesaid article i.e. vehicle be released to the rightful owner subject to the following conditions:

1. IO shall prepare detailed panchnama mentioning the colour, appearance, registered owner and other necessary details of the articles.
2. IO shall take the colour photographs of the aforesaid articles from different angles
3. The photographs should be attested and counter signed by the complainant, accused and the applicant;
4. IO shall get the articles valued from a proper valuer and shall take a valuation report in this regard from the valuer;
5. IO shall take the security bond of appropriate value from the applicant, taking into consideration the valuation report;

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**State Vs. Rameshwari**  
**FIR No. 839/18**  
**PS: Sultan Puri**  
**U/s. 420/468/471 IPC**

**Fresh charge-sheet received.**

02.05.2020

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for State.

IO SI Parmender Kumar in person.

Accused Rameshwari is reportedly in JC but not being produced today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **18.05.2020 at 2.00 p.m or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning.**

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**State Vs. Amit & Anr.**  
**e-FIR No. 003945/19**  
**PS: North Rohini**  
**U/s. 379/411/34 IPC**

**Fresh charge-sheet received.**

02.05.2020

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for State.

IO HC Rishipal in person.

Accused Amit and Rohit are reportedly in JC but not being produced today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **18.05.2020 at 2.00 p.m or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning.**

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

FIR No. 184/2020  
PS: Subhash Place  
State Vs. Manoj Kumar  
U/s. 188 IPC  
Vehicle No. DL8SAW0593

**02.05.2020**

**Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing**

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Aman Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID -19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application has been filed by the applicant for release of Vehicle No. DL8SAW0593 on superdari. Reply has been filed by IO HC Deepak Saini from PS Subhash Place and submitted that there is no objection for the release of the aforesaid article to the owner. Heard.

**Let the vehicle be released to its rightful owner subject to production original documents.**

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed in *Manjit Singh Vs. State CRL. M.C.4485/2013 and CRL.M.A. NO. 16055/2013 decided on 10.09.2014* as follows:

*“Valuable articles*

- 1. The valuable articles seized by the police may be released to. the person, who, in the opinion of the Court, is lawfully entitled to claim such as the complainant at whose house theft, robbery or dacoity has taken place, after preparing detailed panchnama of such articles; taking photographs of such articles and a security bond.*
- 2. The photographs of such articles should be attested or countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over. Wherever necessary, the Court may get the jewelery articles valued from a government approved valuer.*

:2:

3. *The actual production of the valuable articles during the trial should not be insisted upon and the photographs along with the panchnama should suffice for the purposes of evidence.*

4. *Where such articles are not handed over either to the complainant or to the person from whom such articles were seized or to its claimant, then the Court may direct that such articles be kept in a locker.*

5. *If required, the Court may direct that such articles be handed back to the Investigating Officer for further investigation and identification. However, in no circumstance, the Investigating Officer should keep such articles in custody for a longer period for the purposes of investigation and identification.*

6. *If articles are required to be kept in police custody, the SHO shall, after preparing proper panchnama, keep such articles in a locker.*

In these circumstances the aforesaid article i.e. vehicle be released to the rightful owner subject to the following conditions:

IO shall prepare detailed panchnama mentioning the colour, appearance, registered owner and other necessary details of the articles.

IO shall take the colour photographs of the aforesaid articles from different angles

The photographs should be attested and counter signed by the complainant, accused and the applicant;

IO shall get the articles valued from a proper valuer and shall take a valuation report in this regard from the valuer;

IO shall take the security bond of appropriate value from the applicant, taking into consideration the valuation report;

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**FIR No.378/20**

**PS: Mangol Puri**

**State Vs. Jeetu**

**U/s. 188/269/271 IPC**

**Vehicle No. TATA 407 DL-1LR-7046**

**02.05.2020**

**Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing**

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Satish Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID -19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application has been filed by the applicant for release of Vehicle No.**TATA 407 DL-1LR-7046** on superdari. Reply has been filed by IO ASI Mahesh Kumar from PS Mangol Puri and submitted that there is no objection for the release of the aforesaid article to the owner. Heard.

**Let the vehicle be released to its rightful owner subject to production original documents.**

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed in *Manjit Singh Vs. State CRL. M.C.4485/2013 and CRL.M.A. NO. 16055/2013 decided on 10.09.2014* as follows:

*“Valuable articles*

- 1. The valuable articles seized by the police may be released to. the person, who, in the opinion of the Court, is lawfully entitled to claim such as the complainant at whose house theft, robbery or dacoity has taken place, after preparing detailed panchnama of such articles; taking photographs of such articles and a security bond.*
- 2. The photographs of such articles should be attested or countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over. Wherever necessary, the Court may get the jewelery articles valued from a government approved valuer.*



3. *The actual production of the valuable articles during the trial should not be insisted upon and the photographs along with the panchnama should suffice for the purposes of evidence.*

4. *Where such articles are not handed over either to the complainant or to the person from whom such articles were seized or to its claimant, then the Court may direct that such articles be kept in a locker.*

5. *If required, the Court may direct that such articles be handed back to the Investigating Officer for further investigation and identification. However, in no circumstance, the Investigating Officer should keep such articles in custody for a longer period for the purposes of investigation and identification.*

6. *If articles are required to be kept in police custody, the SHO shall, after preparing proper panchnama, keep such articles in a locker.*

In these circumstances the aforesaid article i.e. vehicle be released to the rightful owner subject to the following conditions:

IO shall prepare detailed panchnama mentioning the colour, appearance, registered owner and other necessary details of the articles.

IO shall take the colour photographs of the aforesaid articles from different angles

The photographs should be attested and counter signed by the complainant, accused and the applicant;

IO shall get the articles valued from a proper valuer and shall take a valuation report in this regard from the valuer;

IO shall take the security bond of appropriate value from the applicant, taking into consideration the valuation report;

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

FIR No.129/20  
PS: South Rohini  
U/s. 188 IPC  
Vehicle No. HR 77B 4090  
**02.05.2020**

**Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing**

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Mahendra Kumar Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID -19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application has been filed by the applicant for release of Vehicle No.HR 77B 4090 on superdari. Reply has been filed by IO ASI Ramesh Singh from PS South Rohini and submitted that there is no objection for the release of the aforesaid article to the owner. Heard.

**Let the vehicle be released to its rightful owner subject to production original documents.**

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed in *Manjit Singh Vs. State CRL. M.C.4485/2013 and CRL.M.A. NO. 16055/2013 decided on 10.09.2014* as follows:

*“Valuable articles*

- 1. The valuable articles seized by the police may be released to. the person, who, in the opinion of the Court, is lawfully entitled to claim such as the complainant at whose house theft, robbery or dacoity has taken place, after preparing detailed panchnama of such articles; taking photographs of such articles and a security bond.*
- 2. The photographs of such articles should be attested or countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over. Wherever necessary, the Court may get the jewelery articles valued from a government approved valuer.*
- 3. The actual production of the valuable articles during the trial should not be insisted upon and the photographs along fwith the panchnama should suffice for the purposes of evidence.*

:2:

4. *Where such articles are not handed over either to the complainant or to the person from whom such articles were seized or to its claimant, then the Court may direct that such articles be kept in a locker.*

5. *If required, the Court may direct that such articles be handed back to the Investigating Officer for further investigation and identification. However, in no circumstance, the Investigating Officer should keep such articles in custody for a longer period for the purposes of investigation and identification.*

6. *If articles are required to be kept in police custody, the SHO shall, after preparing proper panchnama, keep such articles in a locker.*

In these circumstances the aforesaid article i.e. vehicle be released to the rightful owner subject to the following conditions:

IO shall prepare detailed panchnama mentioning the colour, appearance, registered owner and other necessary details of the articles.

IO shall take the colour photographs of the aforesaid articles from different angles

The photographs should be attested and counter signed by the complainant, accused and the applicant;

IO shall get the articles valued from a proper valuer and shall take a valuation report in this regard from the valuer;

IO shall take the security bond of appropriate value from the applicant, taking into consideration the valuation report;

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

FIR No.106/20  
PS: Budh Vihar  
State Vs. Madhur Jain  
U/s. 188/269 IPC  
Vehicle No. DL-2C-AU-9234

**02.05.2020**

**Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing**

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Dinesh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID -19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application has been filed by the applicant for release of Vehicle No. DL-2C-AU-9234 on superdari. Reply has been filed by IO ASI Rajpall from PS Budh Vihar and submitted that there is no objection for the release of the aforesaid article to the owner. Heard.

**Let the vehicle be released to its rightful owner subject to production original documents.**

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed in *Manjit Singh Vs. State CRL. M.C.4485/2013 and CRL.M.A. NO. 16055/2013 decided on 10.09.2014* as follows:

*“Valuable articles*

- 1. The valuable articles seized by the police may be released to. the person, who, in the opinion of the Court, is lawfully entitled to claim such as the complainant at whose house theft, robbery or dacoity has taken place, after preparing detailed panchnama of such articles; taking photographs of such articles and a security bond.*
- 2. The photographs of such articles should be attested or countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over. Wherever necessary, the Court may get the jewelery articles valued from a government approved valuer.*

:2:

3. *The actual production of the valuable articles during the trial should not be insisted upon and the photographs along with the panchnama should suffice for the purposes of evidence.*

4. *Where such articles are not handed over either to the complainant or to the person from whom such articles were seized or to its claimant, then the Court may direct that such articles be kept in a locker.*

5. *If required, the Court may direct that such articles be handed back to the Investigating Officer for further investigation and identification. However, in no circumstance, the Investigating Officer should keep such articles in custody for a longer period for the purposes of investigation and identification.*

6. *If articles are required to be kept in police custody, the SHO shall, after preparing proper panchnama, keep such articles in a locker.*

In these circumstances the aforesaid article i.e. vehicle be released to the rightful owner subject to the following conditions:

IO shall prepare detailed panchnama mentioning the colour, appearance, registered owner and other necessary details of the articles.

IO shall take the colour photographs of the aforesaid articles from different angles

The photographs should be attested and counter signed by the complainant, accused and the applicant;

IO shall get the articles valued from a proper valuer and shall take a valuation report in this regard from the valuer;

IO shall take the security bond of appropriate value from the applicant, taking into consideration the valuation report;

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

FIR No. 335/20  
PS: Raj Park Outer District  
State Vs. Albela  
U/s. 188/269/270/34 IPC  
Vehicle No. UP-12-AT-1352

**02.05.2020**

**Proceedings conducted through Video Conferencing**

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Ashish, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Due to outbreak and spread of novel Corona Virus (COVID -19) pandemic as well as the nationwide lockdown imposed by the Government, the hearing of present matter has been conducted through Video-Conferencing using CISCO WEBEX Meeting App after taking consent of the parties concerned in terms of directions issued by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts.

An application has been filed by the applicant for release of Vehicle No. UP-12-AT-1352 on superdari. Reply has been filed by IO HC Pramod from PS Raj Park and submitted that there is no objection for the release of the aforesaid article to the owner. Heard.

**Let the vehicle be released to its rightful owner subject to production original documents.**

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed in *Manjit Singh Vs. State CRL. M.C.4485/2013 and CRL.M.A. NO. 16055/2013 decided on 10.09.2014* as follows:

*“Valuable articles*

- 1. The valuable articles seized by the police may be released to. the person, who, in the opinion of the Court, is lawfully entitled to claim such as the complainant at whose house theft, robbery or dacoity has taken place, after preparing detailed panchnama of such articles; taking photographs of such articles and a security bond.*
- 2. The photographs of such articles should be attested or countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over. Wherever necessary, the Court may get the jewelery articles valued from a government approved valuer.*

:2:

3. *The actual production of the valuable articles during the trial should not be insisted upon and the photographs along with the panchnama should suffice for the purposes of evidence.*

4. *Where such articles are not handed over either to the complainant or to the person from whom such articles were seized or to its claimant, then the Court may direct that such articles be kept in a locker.*

5. *If required, the Court may direct that such articles be handed back to the Investigating Officer for further investigation and identification. However, in no circumstance, the Investigating Officer should keep such articles in custody for a longer period for the purposes of investigation and identification.*

6. *If articles are required to be kept in police custody, the SHO shall, after preparing proper panchnama, keep such articles in a locker.*

In these circumstances the aforesaid article i.e. vehicle be released to the rightful owner subject to the following conditions:

IO shall prepare detailed panchnama mentioning the colour, appearance, registered owner and other necessary details of the articles.

IO shall take the colour photographs of the aforesaid articles from different angles

The photographs should be attested and counter signed by the complainant, accused and the applicant;

IO shall get the articles valued from a proper valuer and shall take a valuation report in this regard from the valuer;

IO shall take the security bond of appropriate value from the applicant, taking into consideration the valuation report;

The Incharge, Computer Branch is directed to upload the order/proceedings on the Website of District Courts.

Copy of this order be also provided to all concerned.

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty MM: North West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**State Vs. Arun @ Lucky & Anr.**  
**e-FIR No. 007002/20**  
**PS: Keshav Puram**  
**U/s. 379/411/34 IPC**

**Fresh charge-sheet received.**

02.05.2020

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for State.

IO HC Kamlesh Kumar in person.

Accused Rakesh Singh and Arun @ Lucky are reportedly in JC but not produced today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **18.05.2020 at 2.00 p.m or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning.**

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**



**State Vs. Arun @ Lucky & Anr.**  
**e-FIR No. 001597/20**  
**PS: Keshav Puram**  
**U/s. 379/411/34 IPC**

**Fresh charge-sheet received.**

02.05.2020

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for State.

IO HC Kamlesh Kumar in person.

Accused Rakesh Singh and Arun @ Lucky are reportedly in JC but not produced today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **18.05.2020 at 2.00 p.m or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning.**

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**

**State Vs. Arun @ Lucky & Anr.**  
**e-FIR No. 000165/20**  
**PS: Keshav Puram**  
**U/s. 379/411/34 IPC**

**Fresh charge-sheet received.**

02.05.2020

Present : Sh. Manish Kaushik, Ld. APP for State.

IO HC Kamlesh Kumar in person.

Accused Rakesh Singh and Arun @ Lucky are reportedly in JC but not produced today.

Charge-sheet be sent to the concerned Court through Facilitation Centre for **18.05.2020 at 2.00 p.m or for any other day when the Court resumes normal functioning.**

**(ANURAG THAKUR)**  
**Duty M.M.: North-West**  
**Rohini: Delhi/02.05.2020**