

SC No. 9098/16

State Vs. Gyan Singh & Ors

FIR No. 782/14

PS Vasant Kunj North

18.07.2020

Present: None.

Due to outbreak of Covid-19 Pandemic, the functioning of District Courts have been suspended w.e.f. 23.03.2020 to 31.07.2020 by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order (s) dated 23.03.2020, 25.03.2020, 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 & 14.07.2020.

Hence, in compliance of said orders, the present matter was adjourned enbloc on the following dates viz. 28.05.2020, 15.07.2020 and today I.e. 18.07.2020 .

Re-notify again on 23.09.2020 for the purpose fixed.

(ANIL ANTIL)  
ASJ-04 NDD/PHC  
New Delhi

SC No. 288/19

State Vs. Banshi Kumar @ Bunty @ Sonu & Ors.

FIR No. 299/18

PS Delhi Cantt.

18.07.2020

Present: None.

Due to outbreak of Covid-19 Pandemic, the functioning of District Courts have been suspended w.e.f. 23.03.2020 to 31.07.2020 by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order (s) dated 23.03.2020, 25.03.2020, 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 & 14.07.2020.

Hence, in compliance of said orders, the present matter was adjourned enbloc on the following dates viz. 28.05.2020 and today i.e. 18.07.2020 .

Re-notify again on 23.09.2020 for the purpose fixed.

(ANIL ANTIL)  
ASJ-04 NDD/PHC  
New Delhi

CA No. 256/17

Chiranji Lal Vs. Food Inspector

18.07.2020

Present: None.

Due to outbreak of Covid-19 Pandemic, the functioning of District Courts have been suspended w.e.f. 23.03.2020 to 31.07.2020 by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order (s) dated 23.03.2020, 25.03.2020, 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 & 14.07.2020.

Hence, in compliance of said orders, the present matter was adjourned enbloc on the following dates viz. 28.05.2020 and today I.e. 18.07.2020.

Re-notify again on 23.09.2020 for the purpose fixed.

(ANIL ANTIL)  
ASJ-04 NDD/PHC  
New Delhi

CA No. 242/19

Ranjit Singh Vs. Amandeep Singh

18.07.2020

Present: None.

Due to outbreak of Covid-19 Pandemic, the functioning of District Courts have been suspended w.e.f. 23.03.2020 to 31.07.2020 by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order (s) dated 23.03.2020, 25.03.2020, 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 & 14.07.2020.

Hence, in compliance of said orders, the present matter was adjourned enbloc on the following dates viz. 28.05.2020 and today I.e. 18.07.2020.

Re-notify again on 26.09.2020 for the purpose fixed.

(ANIL ANTIL)  
ASJ-04 NDD/PHC  
New Delhi

CR No. 207/20

Govinder Singh Vs. State

FIR No.200/17

PS Chanakya Puri

18.07.2020

Present: None.

Due to outbreak of Covid-19 Pandemic, the functioning of District Courts have been suspended w.e.f. 23.03.2020 to 31.07.2020 by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order (s) dated 23.03.2020, 25.03.2020, 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 & 14.07.2020.

Hence, in compliance of said orders, the present matter was adjourned enbloc on the following dates viz. 28.05.2020 and today I.e. 18.07.2020.

Re-notify again on 26.09.2020 for the purpose fixed.

(ANIL ANTIL)  
ASJ-04 NDD/PHC  
New Delhi



**Bail Application No. R-  
State vs. Nirmal Sharma  
FIR No.314/2017  
U/s.302/201/392/397/411/120B/34 IPC  
PS : Delhi Cantt.**

**18.07.2020**

**The proceedings in this case are being done through video conferencing and the undersigned has conducted the proceedings through video conferencing from my residence.**

Present : Sh. Dharam Chand, Addl. PP for State through VC.  
Sh. Love Dixit, Counsel for applicant/accused Nirmal Sharma,  
through VC.

Present application for grant of interim bail has been filed on behalf of applicant/accused Nirmal Sharma on the ground that his case is covered under the guidelines of Hon'ble Delhi High Court as issued vide Minutes of Meeting dated 18.05.2020. The accused is facing trial for the offences u/s. 302/201/392/397/411/120B/34. Accused has been in custody for more than two years.

As per the report of the jail authorities, the conduct of the accused in jail has been satisfactory. As per the report of the IO, accused had no previous involvement in any other criminal matter. Earlier it was reported that the accused was involved in case FIR no.54/2017, u/s.379B/34 IPC, PS Sec.18, Gurugram, Haryana. However, today, the IO has submitted that a report was called from the aforesaid Police Station. As per report, accused is not involved in this case and the said FIR had already been untraced on 14.10.2017.

In these circumstances, the case of the applicant/accused is covered within the guidelines of the High Power Committee of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court. The application for grant of interim bail is accordingly allowed. The applicant/accused is admitted to interim bail for a period of 45 days on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- to the satisfaction of the concerned Jail Superintendent. The interim bail is granted subject to the condition that the applicant shall not leave the jurisdiction of this court without prior permission and shall not tamper with the

evidence or threaten the witnesses. The applicant shall surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent on 01.09.2020.

Copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent for his information.

Order be uploaded on the website of Delhi District Court.

**(Parveen Singh)**  
**ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi**  
**18.07.2020**  
**(Through VC)**

It is certified that Video Conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised by either of the parties regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**Reader/18.07.2020**

State v. Rajesh @ Karambir & Ors.  
FIR No. 63/14  
PS Spl. Cell  
U/s 3/4 MCOC Act

18.07.2020

The proceedings in this case are being done through video conferencing and undersigned has conducted the proceedings through VC from my residence.

Present : Sh. Dharam Chand, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.  
Sh. Ujjwal Puri, Ld. counsel for applicant Pradeep @ Dhaula through VC.

Today, the matter is fixed for orders on the bail application moved on behalf of accused Pradeep @ Dhaula.

This application was moved on 05.03.2020, before lockdown and suspension of regular court hearing. Thereafter, an application for early hearing was moved and on the basis of that application, this application had been taken up for arguments through VC.

Vide my separate order of even date announced through VC, the application has been dismissed. Order be uploaded on website of Delhi District Court.

(Parveen Singh)  
ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi  
18.07.2020  
(Through VC)

Page No. 1

(Parveen Singh)  
ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi  
18.07.2020



State v. Rajesh @ Karambir & Ors.  
FIR No. 63/14  
PS Spl. Cell  
U/s 3/4 MCOC Act

18.07.2020

**ORDER ON BAIL APPLICATION OF ACCUSED PRADEEP @ DHAULA**

Vide this order, I shall dispose of an application for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused Pradeep @ Dhaura, who has been charge sheeted for offences punishable u/s 3 and 4 of MCOC Act.

This application was moved on 05.03.2020, before lockdown and suspension of regular court hearing. Thereafter, an application for early hearing was moved and on the basis of that application, this application has been taken up for arguments through VC.

In the application, it is submitted that the applicant has been falsely framed in this case. The approval to invoke the provisions of MCOC Act was taken on 22.12.2014. In the order of the approval, name of accused was not mentioned. It is further submitted that FIR in this case was registered on 26.12.2014 and in the FIR, name of the applicant was not mentioned. It is further submitted that the applicant is stated to be connected with

accused Rajesh @ Karambir on the basis of two FIRs i.e. FIR No. 533/14 u/s 302 IPC of PS Baba Haridas Nagar and FIR No. 53/14 u/s 186/353 IPC of PS Spl. Cell. It is further submitted that the applicant has been discharged in both the above said cases and the court while discharging the applicant had observed, that no prima facie case was made out against the applicant. It is further submitted that in the present FIR, both the above said cases have been mentioned but they cannot be related to organized crime. It is further submitted that no CDR has been filed by the prosecution to prove that the applicant was in contact with any of the co-accused. It is further submitted that the applicant was elected as Sarpanch of his native village Barhana and a respectable person of the society and has been made scapegoat of political rivalry. It is further submitted that the applicant was arrested on 02.07.2015 and the allegations were leveled that the applicant had provided arms and ammunition and also provided shelter to the main accused. It is further submitted that none of the co-accused have been arrested from the applicant's house or his village to establish any relation of the accused with the co-accused. It is further submitted that nothing has been recovered from the applicant. It is further submitted that earlier also, the applicant was granted interim bail on two occasions and the applicant had not flouted

any of the conditions of the bail. It is further submitted that the applicant is the sole bread earner of his family and due to his custody, his family is at the verge of starvation. It is further submitted that keeping the applicant in custody will not serve any purpose as the investigation has been completed.

I have heard Id. counsel for the applicant and Id. Addl. PP for State.

Ld. counsel for the applicant has contended that there is no evidence against the accused which could connect the accused with the alleged organized crime syndicate led by accused Rajesh @ Karambir. He has further contended that the applicant has already been discharged in FIR No. 533/14 of PS Baba Haridas Nagar and FIR No. 53/14 of PS Spl. Cell. He has further contended that accused was never connected to the crime syndicate on the basis of these two FIRs. He has further contended that as the accused has been discharged in above noted two FIRs, the basis for invoking the provisions of MCOC Act against the accused does not exist. Therefore, no case under MCOC Act is made out against the accused because there is no other FIR against the accused which can connect him to the alleged organized crime syndicate.

Per contra, Id. Addl. PP has contended that accused is an important part of a crime syndicate. The role of the accused

was to provide shelter and arms and ammunition to the members of the syndicate and thus, he is more important than any other active member who would be directly involved in commission of crime on behalf of the syndicate. But for his shelter and support, the syndicate would not have been able to operate. He has further contended that the accused has admitted his role in his statement u/s 18 of MCOC Act.

I have considered the rival submissions and gone through the electronic record sent by the reader.

Apart from the two cases mentioned in the bail application, there are many other cases which have been registered against the accused in Haryana. One of such case was where his house was raided and a large amount of illegal arms and ammunition was recovered. However, the accused managed to escape and was apprehended later on.

Ld. counsel for the accused has admitted that such a case was registered.

The main contention of ld. counsel for the accused is, that there are only two cases whereby the prosecution has sought to connect the applicant with an organized crime syndicate and in both the cases, the accused has been discharged and therefore, the provisions of MCOC Act cannot be applied to him. However, I

disagree with this contention of Id. counsel for the accused because the role that has been attributed to the applicant in the charge sheet is, that he was the one who was providing arms and ammunition and shelter to the members of the gang.

As regards the role of accused as an active supporter and thus, an active member of the gang with a specified duty to provide arms, ammunition and shelter to the member of the gang; I find that there is a statement of the accused u/s 18 MCOC Act wherein he had confession to being a member of this gang and of providing shelter, arms and ammunition to the members of the gang. The statement u/s 18 MCOC Act is admissible in evidence and it shall be a matter of trial whether it can be relied upon to hand down conviction of the accused or not. However, at this stage, the validity, veracity and admissibility of that statement cannot be questioned. This statement is further corroborated by the circumstance where a raid was conducted by the local police at the house of the accused and a large amount of illegal arms and ammunition was recovered.

As regards the contention of Id. counsel for accused that in FIRs No. 533/14 and 53/14, accused has been discharged and the entire basis of invoking MCOC Act against the accused has eroded; I find that this argument does not hold much water. It has

been well settled that in cases under MCOC Act, the requirement is, that there should exist an organized crime syndicate or gang, it should be engaged in continuing unlawful activities and the person charged under this Act should be a member of that crime syndicate. What is further required is, that in respect of unlawful activities of this crime syndicate, more than one charge sheet must have been filed for unlawful activities carrying punishment of more than three years and a court of competent jurisdiction should have taken cognizance of those charge sheets. Therefore, even if the accused had not been named in any of the FIRs related to this crime syndicate, he could still have been charged under MCOC Act had it been shown, that there existed a crime syndicate, that accused was a member of that crime syndicate, that the said crime syndicate was engaged in continuing unlawful activities, that more than one charge sheet had been filed with regard to unlawful activities of that crime syndicate for offence having punishment of more than three years and, that a court of competent jurisdiction had taken cognizance of those chargesheets. There is no denial to the fact that there have been numerous charge sheets against accused Rajesh @ Karambir and his gang for the offences carrying punishment more than three years and various courts had taken cognizance of those charge sheets.

Therefore, even if the accused had not been charged sheeted in two FIRs i.e FIR No. 533/14 and 53/14, the accused would still be liable to be charged under MCOC Act, had he been found to be a member of this crime syndicate; and as discussed above the confessional statement of the accused and the circumstance of recovery of large amount of illegal arms and ammunition from his house connect this accused to this crime syndicate. Therefore, even otherwise, the discharge of the accused in these two charge sheets does not effect the case of the prosecution against the accused.

I accordingly find that the accused has not been able to satisfy the conditions of bail u/s 21 (4) MCOC Act and thus, he is not entitled to grant of bail. The application at hand is accordingly dismissed. Order be uploaded on website of Delhi District Court.

**(Parveen Singh)**  
**ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi**  
**18. 07. 2020**  
**(Through VC)**

It is certified that Video Conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised by either of the parties regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

18.07.2020

Reader/

Page No. 10

(Parveen Singh)  
ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi  
18.07.2020

**OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE : PATIALA HOUSE COURT : NEW DELHI  
DISTRICT : NEW DELHI**

**ORDER**

As it has been reported that Sh. Inderjeet Singh, Group-C, posted in Bail & Filing Section, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, has been tested Covid-19 positive today i.e. on 18.07.2020, accordingly, it is hereby ordered that as per protocol, the entire Administrative Block / Facilitation Centre (Ground Floor), Patiala House Court Complex, New Delhi District, shall remain closed/sealed for 18.07.2020 and 19.07.2020 respectively for carrying out its immediate deep disinfection and sanitisation. All the staff posted in the Administrative Block / Facilitation Centre (Ground Floor), Patiala House Court, New Delhi District are hereby directed to resume their duties on 20.07.2020 and strictly adhere to the norms of social distancing.

**DINESH  
KUMAR  
SHARMA** Digitally signed  
by DINESH  
KUMAR SHARMA  
Date: 2020.07.18  
16:51:26 +0530

**[Dinesh Kumar Sharma]**  
District & Sessions Judge  
Patiala House Court,  
New Delhi District, New Delhi

No. 8738-8787 Admn./D&SJ/NDD/2020

Dated : 18.07.2020

Copy forwarded for information & necessary action to :

1. The Registrar General, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, New Delhi.
2. The District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
3. The Principal Judge, Family Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi.
4. The Judge In-charge, Mediation Centre, New Delhi District, PHC, ND.
5. All the Judicial Officers, New Delhi District, New Delhi.
6. The Officer Incharge, Bail & Filing Section, New Delhi District, PHC, ND.
7. The Chief Public Prosecutor, New Delhi District, New Delhi.
8. The Hony. Secretary, NDBA.
9. In-charge, Lock-up, New Delhi District, New Delhi.
10. The Administrative Officer (Judicial), New Delhi District, New Delhi.
11. The Superintendent, NDDLISA, New Delhi District, ND.
12. All the Branch Incharges, New Delhi District, PHC.
13. P.S. to the undersigned.
14. Website Committee (Hindi & English), THC, with the request to upload the same on the website of the Court.
15. The District System Administrator, NDD to upload the same on the website of this District.
16. The Caretaker, New Delhi District, NDD for immediate compliance and to display the same on the Notice Board.
17. Guard file.

**DINESH  
KUMAR  
SHARMA** Digitally signed by  
DINESH KUMAR SHARMA  
Date: 2020.07.18 16:51:36  
+0530

**[District & Sessions Judge]**  
Patiala House Court,  
New Delhi District, New Delhi

State v. Digvijay Saroha  
FIR No. 252/18  
U/s. 3 & 4 MCOC Act  
PS Spl. Cell

18.07.2020

The proceedings in this case are being done through video conferencing and undersigned has conducted the proceedings through VC from my residence.

Present : Sh. Dharam Chand, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.  
Sh. Ujjwal Puri, Ld. counsel for accused Praveen Bazard @ Lara, through VC.

The present is an application for grant of regular bail application moved on behalf of accused Praveen Bazard @ Lara, who is facing trial before this court u/s 3 & 4 MCOC Act.

It is submitted in the application that at the time of taking approval for invoking the provisions of MCOC Act and also when the sanction was taken, there were only two FIRs registered against the accused. They are: (1)FIR No. 327/16 u/s 379 IPC of PS Gannaur and (2) FIR no. 380/16, U/s 353/224/397/120B IPC and sections 25/54/59 Arms Act of PS City Bahadurgarh. It is further submitted that in FIR No. 327/16, there were in total three accused and they were not a part of Jitender @ Gogi gang and the applicant had been acquitted in that case. The acquittal order is

Page No. 1

(Parveen Singh)  
ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi  
18.07.2020

annexed with the application. It is further submitted that in FIR No. 380/16, the applicant has been granted bail with an observation that no evidence has been collected against the applicant by the investigating agency. It is further submitted that the applicant has not been named in any of the FIR on the basis of which MCOC Act provisions have been invoked against him. It is further submitted that the applicant was not even named in the present FIR and had been arrested in the present case after the investigation was completed and the main charge sheet was filed. It is further submitted that MCOC Act could not be invoked if there is no organized crime syndicate and the two FIRs that had been registered against the applicant could not constitute an organized crime. Reliance has been placed on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of Maharashtra v. Shiva @ Shivaji Ramji Sonawane and State (NCT of Delhi) v. Brijesh Singh @ Arun Kumar. Relying upon these judgments, it is submitted that the MCOCA charges can only be invoked if a person is a part of the organized crime. It is further submitted that there are three public witnesses who have alleged that they used to give money to Gogi Gang and they have not named the applicant in their statements u/s 161 Cr.P.C. It is further submitted that as per the

prosecution, the applicant was living lavishly with the money sent to him by Gogi Gang but the reality is, that the applicant is living in extreme poverty and photo of his house is attached with the application. It is further submitted that the applicant has not given any voluntary disclosure statement u/s 18 of MCOG Act and his signatures were taken on a pre written statement and the statement was not read over to him. It is further submitted that the applicant is the sole bread earner of his family. It is further submitted that the mother of the applicant is suffering from various ailments and there is no one to look after his mother. The medical documents of applicant's mother have been annexed with the application.

In the reply to the bail application, it is submitted that the accused is an active member of an organized crime syndicate led by accused Jitender @ Gogi. The gang is involved in many cases of murder, extortion etc. The gang is having a history of escape from the police custody and the present applicant had played an active role in the escape of gang leader Jitender @ Gogi from the police custody while he was being taken from Delhi to Haryana for his production before the court. A separate case was registered in that regard and the applicant was arrested in that

case. It is further submitted that in their statements u/s 18 of MCOC Act which have been vetted by the court, other two accused in this case namely Yogesh and Dinesh have stated that Praveen is an active member of the gang. Efforts were made to arrest him but he could not be arrested as he had absconded with the gang and hence, NBWs and process u/s 82/83 Cr.P.C were issued against him by the court.

It is further submitted that the accused has taken a ground that at the time of invoking the MCOC Act and when sanction was granted, only two FIRs were registered against him. Those two FIRs do not constitute organized crime and provisions of MCOC Act cannot be invoked against him. It is further submitted that the issue has been settled by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in bail application no. 1639/2019 of accused Dig Vijay Sirhoa wherein, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi had held:-

Perusal of the above judgments reveal that the requirement of one or more chargesheet relates to unlawful activities of the organized crime syndicate and does not pertain to a particular member of the crime syndicate accused. The contention of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner that in the absence of two chargesheet against the petitioner, he could not have been charged

with Bail Appl. No. 1638/2019 Page no.14 MCOCA and he be released on bail is, therefore, not in consonance with law.

.....The MCOC Act does not contemplate that the petitioner should have direct role to play as regards the commission of an organised crime.

As regards the ailment of mother of the applicant, it is submitted that the documents have been verified and as per the report of the doctor, the ailments are low back ache and knee pain and she is taking medicines for that. It is further submitted that if the applicant is released on bail, there is a strong possibility that he may jump the bail or indulge in gang war with the rival gang.

I have heard ld. counsel for the applicant and ld. Addl. PP for the State and perused the record very carefully.

Ld. counsel for the accused has contended that as in the entire charge sheet and at the time of grant of sanction, there were only two FIRs against the accused which were not connected to the activities of Gogi gang. Therefore, the accused could not have been charged under the provisions of MCOC Act and thus, the applicant is entitled to bail.

The second rung of his contention is, that out of three public witnesses, who have deposed about the extortion by

Gogi gang, none has deposed about any role being played by the accused in that extortion.

Per contra, Id. Addl. PP has contended that statements u/s 18 of MCOC Act are admissible piece of evidence. The co-accused have clearly stated the present applicant was a part of Jitender @ Gogi gang. Furthermore, the accused himself in his statement u/s 18 of MCOC Act has admitted that he was associated with Gogi Gang and used to extort money on behalf of the gang. He has further contended that even FIR No. 380/16 of PS Bahadurgarh was related to this gang only and the said FIR was registered when with the help of his associates, including the applicant, the head of the gang namely Jitender @ Gogi had escaped from the police custody.

I have considered the rival submissions.

The prime contention of Id. counsel for the accused is that as at the time of taking approval for invoking MCOC Act and when subsequent sanction for prosecution was granted, there were only two FIRs against this accused and those were not connected to organized crime and thus, accused is entitled to bail.

However, I find that this contention of Id. counsel for accused is not tenable under law because Hon'ble High Court of

Delhi in the case of Dig Vijay Saroha, who is also an accused in this case, had clearly held that FIRs on the basis of which provisions of MCOC Act can be attracted are to be the FIRs reflecting the existence of organized crime syndicate its continuing unlawful activities.

Therefore, it does not make any difference whether an individual had been named in a FIR or not. What is required is the existence of a crime syndicate and the membership or association of the said accused with the crime syndicate.

In the present case, association of the accused with the Gogi Gang is reflected from one of the FIR mentioned in the bail application itself. The said FIR is FIR No. 380/2016 of PS Bahadurgarh. That FIR was registered when accused Jitender @ Gogi had escaped from the police custody and the present applicant was arrested for his role in that escape. This somehow reflects the association of the accused with the Gogi Gang.

As regards the public witnesses not deposing about the role of the accused in extortion on behalf of Jitender @ Gogi gang, I find that there is a confessional statement of accused u/s 18 MCOC Act. Ld. counsel for accused had candidly admitted that that accused in his own statement u/s 18 of MCOC Act had

admitted being a member of Gogi Gang and that he was extorting money on behalf of the gang.

The statements u/s 18 MCOC Act are admissible in evidence and are in no manner to be considered to be of an inferior quality of evidence. This evidence stands on equal footing with all other evidence that the prosecution seeks to bring. Therefore, prima facie there is evidence of accused being a member of an organized crime syndicate and therefore, on this ground, the accused is not entitled to bail.

The next ground taken for seeking bail is that his mother is suffering from various ailments. However, as per the report of the doctor, the mother of the accused is having back ache and knee pain for which she is taking medicines. I find that the ailments which the mother of the applicant is suffering from are old age related ailments and there is no serious condition or medical emergency which would call for grant of bail or interim bail to the applicant.

The application at hand is accordingly dismissed. Order be uploaded on website of Delhi District Court.

**(Parveen Singh)**  
**ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi**  
**18. 07. 2020**  
**(Through VC)**

It is certified that Video Conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised by either of the parties regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**Reader/**

**18. 07. 2020**

**Bail Application No. R-  
State vs. Naresh @ Nishu  
FIR No.964/2016  
U/s.498A/304B/302/306/34 IPC  
PS : Delhi Cantt.**

**18.07.2020**

**The proceedings in this case are being done through video conferencing and the undersigned has conducted the proceedings through video conferencing from my residence.**

Present : Sh. Dharam Chand, Addl. PP for State through VC.  
Ms. Aishwarya Dwivedi, Counsel for applicant/accused Naresh @ Nishu,  
through VC

This is an application for extension of interim bail filed on behalf of applicant/accused Naresh @ Nishu. Vide order dated 03.06.2020, the accused was granted interim bail for a period of 45 days. This bail was granted on the ground of illness of his wife. Thereafter, present application for extension of interim bail was moved on the ground that the accused is facing life threat due to spread of COVID-19 pandemic and thus his medical documents were sent for verification. However, today Ld. Counsel for the accused has relied upon the order of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in WP(C) No.3037/2020 in the Court of its own motion vs. State & Ors. as passed on 13.07.2020. In that order, Hon'ble Delhi High Court in para nos.6 & 7 has observed as under:

*“6. The Hon'ble Single Bench of this Court in Crl.A.193/2020 titled as Harpreet Singh vs. State vide order dated 1st July, 2020 sought clarification to the following effect:*

*“7. The queries that the Hon'ble Full Bench may consider and decide for the guidance of all concerned are as follows:*

*a. Whether the orders made by the Hon'ble Full Bench in W.P. (C) No.3037/2020, including last order dated 15.06.2020, apply to all interim orders, whether made in civil or criminal matters, and regardless of whether such orders were made on or before 16.03.2020 or thereafter?*

*b. Where interim bail or interim suspension of sentence has been granted by a Bench of this court exercising discretion and based upon specific facts and circumstances of a given case, would such orders also stand automatically extended by operation of orders made by the Full Bench in W.P.(C) No.3037/2020?*

*8. While deciding the issue, the Hon'ble Full Bench may consider the aspect of parity, namely that, on a plain reading of the orders in W.P.(C) No.3037/2020, interim orders granted on or before 16.03.2020 appear to be getting extended by general directions; but those made after 16.03.2020 appear not to be covered thereby."*

*7. In this regard, we make it clear that all the directions issued from time to time in this case are based on the ongoing pandemic situation in Delhi. So far as the criminal matters are concerned, these directions have been issued keeping in view the fact that the jail authorities have limited space to keep the inmates and in case of spread of Covid-19 pandemic in the jail, it would not be in a position to maintain physical distancing amongst jail inmates. Looking to this aspect and the possible threat of spreading of viral infection by those persons who are on interim bail/bail/parole granted by this Court or the Courts subordinate to this Court, to other inmates of the jail on their return to the jail, the decision of extension of interim bail/bail/parole has been taken from time to time. It is clarified that this order of extension of bail/interim bail/parole shall be applicable to all undertrials/convicts, who are on bail/interim bail or parole as on date irrespective of the fact that they were released on bail/interim bail or parole before or after 16th March, 2020."*

In view of the above clarifications and directions of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, it is amply clear that the extension of interim bail as granted by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the aforesaid writ petition is applicable to all interim bail orders irrespective of the fact whether they were passed before or after 16.03.2020 and irrespective of the fact whether the interim bail had been granted by the court in exercise of its discretion on specific facts and circumstances of a given case.

Considering this mandate of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, the interim bail of applicant/accused Naresh @ Nishu automatically stand extended on the same terms and conditions upto 31.08.2020.

The application stands disposed of.

Copy of the order be sent to the concerned jail authorities.

Order be uploaded on the website of Delhi District Court.

**(Parveen Singh)**  
**ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi**  
**18.07.2020**  
**(Through VC)**

It is certified that Video Conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised by either of the parties regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**Reader/18.07.2020**

**Bail Application No. R-  
State vs. Sanjay Mehlawat  
FIR No.255/2019  
U/s.307/34 IPC & 25 Arms Act  
PS : Vasant Kunj (North)**

**18.07.2020**

**The proceedings in this case are being done through video conferencing and the undersigned has conducted the proceedings through video conferencing from my residence.**

Present : Sh. Dharam Chand, Addl. PP for State through VC.  
Sh. L.N. Rao, Counsel for applicant/accused Sanjay Mehlawat,  
through VC.

The present application has been filed for extension of interim bail as had been granted to the applicant/accused initially vide order dated 05.05.2020 and then extended vide order dated 19.06.2020. Further extension of interim bail has been sought on the basis of order of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in WP(C) No.3037/2020 in the Court of its own motion vs. State & Ors. as passed on 13.07.2020. In that order, Hon'ble Delhi High Court in para nos.6 & 7 has observed as under:

*“6. The Hon'ble Single Bench of this Court in Crl.A.193/2020 titled as Harpreet Singh vs. State vide order dated 1st July, 2020 sought clarification to the following effect:*

*“7. The queries that the Hon'ble Full Bench may consider and decide for the guidance of all concerned are as follows:*

*a. Whether the orders made by the Hon'ble Full Bench in W.P. (C) No.3037/2020, including last order dated 15.06.2020, apply to all interim orders, whether made in civil or criminal matters, and regardless of whether such orders were made on or before 16.03.2020 or thereafter?*

*b. Where interim bail or interim suspension of sentence has been granted by a Bench of this court exercising discretion and based upon specific facts and circumstances of a given case, would such orders also stand automatically extended by operation of orders made by the Full Bench in W.P.(C) No.3037/2020?*

*8. While deciding the issue, the Hon'ble Full Bench may consider the aspect of parity, namely that, on a plain reading of the orders in W.P.(C) No.3037/2020, interim orders granted on or before 16.03.2020 appear to be getting extended by general directions; but those made after 16.03.2020 appear not to be covered thereby."*

*7. In this regard, we make it clear that all the directions issued from time to time in this case are based on the ongoing pandemic situation in Delhi. So far as the criminal matters are concerned, these directions have been issued keeping in view the fact that the jail authorities have limited space to keep the inmates and in case of spread of Covid-19 pandemic in the jail, it would not be in a position to maintain physical distancing amongst jail inmates. Looking to this aspect and the possible threat of spreading of viral infection by those persons who are on interim bail/bail/parole granted by this Court or the Courts subordinate to this Court, to other inmates of the jail on their return to the jail, the decision of extension of interim bail/bail/parole has been taken from time to time. It is clarified that this order of extension of bail/interim bail/parole shall be applicable to all undertrials/convicts, who are on bail/interim bail or parole as on date irrespective of the fact that they were released on bail/interim bail or parole before or after 16th March, 2020."*

In view of the above clarifications and directions of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, the interim bail of the applicant/accused automatically stand extended on the same terms and conditions upto 31.08.2020 and no order is required to be passed by this court.

The application stands disposed of.

Copy of the order be sent to the concerned jail authorities.

Order be uploaded on the website of Delhi District Court.

**(Parveen Singh)**  
**ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi**  
**18.07.2020**  
**(Through VC)**

It is certified that Video Conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised by either of the parties regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**Reader/18.07.2020**

Pankaj Kumar v. State  
CA No. 09/2018

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: None for appellant.

Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State/respondent.

Proceedings have been done through video conferencing.

Since none has appeared on behalf of the appellant, list the appeal for arguments on 10.09.2020.

  
(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

Sampat Ranawat v. State  
CR No. 189/2018

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Sh. K. K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for revisionist.  
Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State/respondent.

Proceedings have been done through video conferencing.

Request has been received from Sh. K. K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the revisionist to adjourn the matter till resumption of normal working of the court.

As prayed, list the matter for arguments on 10.09.2020.

  
(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Ms. Geeta Malhotra, proxy for Sh. Sunil Kumar, Ld. counsel for revisionist.

Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State/respondent.

Proceedings have been done through video conferencing.

Request has been received from Ms. Geeta Malhotra to adjourn the matter for want of main counsel as it is not feasible for him to argue the matter through video conferencing.

A request has also been made on behalf of the Ld. Counsel for revisionist to send further communication/ notices on the email ID of the Ld. counsel for revisionist i.e [advgeetamalhotra@gmail.com](mailto:advgeetamalhotra@gmail.com) and [sjain@knjpartners.com](mailto:sjain@knjpartners.com). Request allowed.

As prayed, list the matter for arguments on 10.09.2020.

  
(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Ms. Geeta Malhotra, proxy for Sh. Sunil Kumar, Ld. counsel for revisionist.

Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State/respondent.

Proceedings have been done through video conferencing.

Put up with the connected revision petition ( 352/2019) for arguments on 10.09.2020.



(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

Directorate of Enforcement v. Dr Jeevan Kumar & Ors.  
Case No 8530/2016

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D& SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. Vikas Arora, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

Proceedings have been done through video conferencing.

Present is an application moved on behalf of accused Dr Jeevan Kumar requesting for sending information to Ambala Jail informing that he is on bail in this case and for cancellation of his production warrants.

Reader of this court is directed to verify the fact from the judicial record and to send the intimation to the concerned Jail Superintendent, Ambala Jail for necessary compliance. The concerned Jail Superintendent be also intimated through email, as mentioned in the prayer column of the application..

Copy of this order be also sent to the Jail Superintendent, Ambala Jail. Copy of this order be given dasti also

Application disposed of accordingly.

  
(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

State v. Ashok @ Kala  
FIR No. 22/2013  
U/s 186/353/307/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act  
PS: Special Cell

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D& SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Sh. Tarun Gehlot, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused/accused.

Proceedings done through video conferencing.

Present is an application moved on behalf of applicant/accused/accused for grant of bail. It is submitted that applicant/accused/accused is in j.c since 23.05.2013. It is submitted that he has been falsely implicated and has nothing to do in the present offence. It is submitted that the charge-sheet in the instant case has already been filed and all the witnesses in the instant case are police officials and there is no likelihood of influencing the witnesses as all witnesses are police officials. It is thus prayed that he be granted bail in the present case.

Ld. Addl. PP has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that allegations are very serious in nature. It is submitted that applicant/accused is also involved in a double murder case titled State v. Balkishan which is also pending in this court. It is further submitted that both the cases are at the stage of recording Statement of Accused and if

applicant/accused is released on bail at this stage, it may hamper the fair course of trial. Hence, his application deserves to be dismissed.

In the instant matter, the applicant/accused is in judicial custody for the last seven years. It is also pertinent to mention that all the material witnesses cited by the prosecution are police official, hence, there are no chances of the applicant/accused influencing the witnesses or tampering with the evidence.

Considering the period of incarceration, applicant/accused Ashok @ Kala is admitted to bail on his furnishing PB/SB in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Ld. MM/Duty MM/Ld. CMM and also subject to the condition that he shall not hamper the fair course of trial and shall not indulge himself in any criminal activity.

Application disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given dasti.

  
(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

State v. Subhash  
FIR No.250/2015  
P.S Chanakya Puri  
U/s 302 IPC  
16.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4425/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State with IO.  
Sh. R. P. Kasana, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused/accused.

Proceedings done through video conferencing.

Present is an application moved on behalf of applicant/accused/accused seeking extension of interim bail granted to him vide order dated 04.06.2020 which is going to expire on 19.07.2020. Ld. counsel has placed reliance upon the directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P (Cr.) No. 3037/2020 titled Court on its own motion v. State & Ors and submitted that he has not misused the liberty granted to him. It is thus prayed that he be granted interim bail till 31.08.2020.

Ld. Addl. PP has vehemently opposed this application on the ground that allegations are serious in nature

Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances, as mentioned in the application and also considering the guidelines dated 13.07.2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in a case titled Court on its Motion v. State & Ors, W.P (Cr.) No. 3037/2020, the interim bail of applicant/accused/accused is extended till 31.08.2020 on the same terms and conditions as mentioned in order dated 04.06.2020. Application is disposed off accordingly.

Copy of the order be given dasti. Copy of the order be also sent to the Jail Superintendent as necessary information.

  
(Dharmender Rana)

ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND/18.07.2020

FIR No.59/2020  
P.S Crime Branch  
U/s 13/16/17/18 UAPA r/w  
124A/153A/302/307/353/186/212/341/395/427/435/436/452/454/109/114/147/14  
8/149/34 IPC & u/s 3/ 4 of Prevention of Damage of Public Property Act and  
25/27 Arms Act  
State v. Asif Iqbal Tanha

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D& S.J/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Sh. Amit Prasad, Ld. Spl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Sowjhanya Shankaran, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

Proceedings done through video conferencing.

Present is an application u/s 439 CrPC r/w Section 43-D(5) of UAPA seeking grant of bail.

Ld. Special PP seeks an adjournment to file reply to the bail application as he has been recently engaged in this case.

Ld. counsel for applicant/accused submitted that she has no objection if the adjournment is granted. However, it is prayed that a copy of said reply be supplied to her in advance to address arguments.

As prayed, list the bail application for filing reply and arguments on 25.07.2020.

Let a copy of the reply be supplied to Ld. counsel for the applicant/accused well in advance before the date fixed.

(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

State v. Rajesh @ Imran  
FIR No: 92/2020  
U/S:186/353/307 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act  
PS Special Cell.

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D& SJ/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State  
Sh. Parveen Dabas, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

Proceedings done through video conferencing.

Present is an application moved on behalf of applicant/accused/accused for grant of bail.

I am not inclined to hear the instant bail application as I am acquainted with Sh. Praveen Dabas, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

The bail application be put up before Ld. District & Sessions Judge, New Delhi District today itself i.e. 18.07.2020 with a request to assign this application to some other court for appropriate orders and for consideration.

  
(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020

18.07.2020

Vide order nos.5837-5927/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dt. 30.05.2020 & 5931-6021/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 01.06.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today in pursuance to the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order no.R-1347/DHC/2020 dated 29.05.2020 and in continuation of the previous office order nos.4243-4333/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 01.04.2020, 4407-4426/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 10.04.2020, 4518-4608/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 15.04.2020, 5111-5200/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 03.05.2020, 6364-6454/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 16.05.2020 and 6326-6415/D&S.J/NDD/2020 dated 15.06.2020 to combat the pandemic of COVID 19.

Present: Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Proceedings done through video conferencing.

An application has been moved by the IO ACP Alok Kumar for recording of statement of the witnesses, as detailed in the application, u/s 164 CrPC in the instant case.

Put up today itself i.e.18.07.2020 before Ld. CMM/Duty MM for appropriate directions.

  
(Dharmender Rana)  
Roster Judge  
ASJ-02/NDD/PHC/ND  
18.07.2020