

State v. Jyoti Prakash @ Jyoti
FIR No. 163/2019
PS Special Cell, New Delhi.
U/s 3/4 MCOC Act.

01.09.2020

Present : Sh. Dharam Chand, Ld. Addl. PP for State through VC.
Accused Jyoti Prakash @ Jyoti, Amit Gulia and Krishan
Kumar produced in police custody.
ACP Sanjay Dutt is present in person.
Sh. Vivek Aggarwal, Ld. LAC for accused persons
through VC.

This is an application for seeking 15 days JC remand of
accused Jyoti Prakash @ Jyoti @ Baba, Amit Gulia and Krishan
Kumar @ Ankush @ Bhalu.

It is submitted in the application that 10 days PC remand
of above named accused was granted vide order dated 21.08.2020
and the same is expiring today. It is further submitted that the above
named accused have been produced before the court after
conducting their COVID 19 test.

It is submitted by the IO that their COVID 19 test report
has come negative.

It is thus prayed that above mentioned accused may be
remanded to JC.

Considering the submissions made in the application,
accused Jyoti Prakash @ Jyoti @ Baba, Amit Gulia and Krishan
Kumar @ Ankush @ Bhalu are remanded to 15 days JC remand.
Accused be produced through VC on 16.09.2020.

Copy of order be given to IO and be sent to the concerned jail superintendent.

(Parveen Singh)
ASJ-03/NDD/PHC/New Delhi
01.09.2020

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/01.09.2020

NCB Vs Eze Naduka Bonaventure & Anr
Case No. SC/175/2020

01.09.2020

Present: Sh. Rajesh Manchanda, Ld SPP for NCB through VC.
IO Mr Sachin Kumar.
Both accused persons not produced from JC.

This complaint has been filed by a public servant in discharge of his duties. He has moved an application for dispensing with his preliminary examination and for his exemption from personal appearance on the ground that he remains busy in official duties and it is not possible for him to attend the court on each and every date of hearing and that be therefore allowed to be represented through the Special PP. In view of the submissions made, the preliminary examination of the complainant is dispensed with and he is exempted from personal appearance during trial.

I have perused the complaint and the documents filed.

Perusal of record prima facie reveals the commission of offence punishable u/s 21(c), 22(c) and 29 NDPS Act. I take cognizance of the offences.

Jail Superintendent is directed to produce the accused persons namely Eze Naduka Bonaventure and Butter Namanni in present case through Video Conferencing on next date of hearing.

List this case for production of accused through VC and further proceedings on 24.09.2020. Copy of this order be sent to jail superintendent on daksection.tihar@gov.in.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Special Judge-NDPS
New Delhi/01.09.2020

SC No. 110/2020
U/s 22/23/29 NDPS Act
NCB Vs Jitender Bhati & Anr

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Rajesh Manchanda, Ld. SPP for NCB through video conferencing.

Both accused are in JC and could not be produced through VC.
Sh Y K Saxena, Ld. Counsel for accused Jitender Bhati through VC.

Sh Gaurav Chandhok, Ld. counsel for accused Monye Alexander through VC.

Despite number of attempts, both the accused persons could not be connected through VC.

List this matter for arguments on charge on **05.09.2020**. Jail superintendent is directed to produce both the accused persons namely Jitender Bhati and Monye Alexander through VC at 11am on said date.

Copy of the order be sent to jail superintendent for compliance on daksection.tihar@gov.in.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

SC No. 374/18
NCB Vs Shubham Singh

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh P C Aggarwal, Ld. SPP for NCB through video conferencing.
Accused on bail but not present.
Sh Dinesh Kothari, Ld. counsel for accused through VC.

Pursuant to order dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi whereby the work in subordinate courts was suspended due to corona pandemic and the work was further suspended vide order dated 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 22.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 and 14.07.2020.

This case was listed on 19.05.2020 for PE and was adjourned en bloc for 07.07.2020 and then for today i.e. 01.09.2020.

List this case for appearance of accused and further proceedings on 02.11.2020. Accused be informed about the next date of hearing through IO.

Copy of this order be sent to IO for compliance.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

SC No. 9580/16
State Vs Bhola Jha & Ors.
FIR No. 272/16
PS Sagarpur

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Ravindra Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State through VC.

Both accused are on bail but not present.

Sh Sumit Sharma, Ld. counsel for accused Sarvan Kaur @ Chhabbo through VC.

Pursuant to order dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi whereby the work in subordinate courts was suspended due to corona pandemic and the work was further suspended vide order dated 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 22.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 and 14.07.2020.

This case was listed on 18.05.2020 for PE and was adjourned en bloc for 07.07.2020 and then for today i.e. 01.09.2020.

List this case for appearance of accused and further proceedings on 02.11.2020. Accused be informed about the next date of hearing through IO.

Copy of this order be sent to IO for compliance.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

NCB vs. Mohd. Wasik and Ors.
SC No. 9364/2016

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Mukesh Malik, Ld. SPP for NCB through VC.

Accused on bail but not present.

Sh Y P Singh Ahluwalia, Ld. Counsel for the accused Mohd Wasik through VC.

Pursuant to order dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi whereby the work in subordinate courts was suspended due to corona pandemic and the work was further suspended vide order dated 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 22.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 and 14.07.2020.

This case was listed on 20.05.2020 for PE and was adjourned en bloc for 07.07.2020 and then for today i.e. 01.09.2020.

List this case for appearance of accused and further proceedings on 02.11.2020. Accused be informed about the next date of hearing through IO.

Copy of this order be sent to IO for compliance.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

NCB Vs. Peshawari Lal
SC No. 8888/16

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh P C Aggarwal, Ld. SPP for NCB through VC.
Accused on bail but not present.
Sh S Satyanarayana, Ld. Counsel for accused through VC.

Pursuant to order dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi whereby the work in subordinate courts was suspended due to corona pandemic and the work was further suspended vide order dated 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 22.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 and 14.07.2020.

This case was listed on 19.05.2020 for PE and was adjourned en bloc for 07.07.2020 and then for today i.e. 01.09.2020.

List this case for appearance of accused and further proceedings on 02.11.2020. Accused be informed about the next date of hearing through IO.

Copy of this order be sent to IO for compliance.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

FIR No. 50/20
SC No. 159/2020
PS Spl Cell
U/s 22/29 NDPS Act
State Vs Puneet Arora & Anr.

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Ravindra Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State
through video conferencing.
Accused Puneet Arora reported to be on interim bail but not
present.
Accused Vinod Kumar not produced from JC.

Ld. Addl. PP for the state submits that there is likelihood that
FSL report will be prepared within 20 days.

Accordingly, at request, list this matter for consideration on
01.10.2020. Jail superintendent is directed to produce accused Vinod
Kumar through VC at 11.00 am on the said date.

Copy of the order be sent to Director, FSL as well as jail
superintendent for compliance on daksection.tihar@gov.in.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

CR No. 249/2020

Rohit Vs CBN

U/s: 8/21/22/28/29 & 30 NDPS Act

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh Rajiv Mohan, Ld. counsel for revisionist Rohit through VC.
Sh. Satish Aggarwala, Ld. SPP for CBN through VC.

Ld. counsel for revisionist requested to raise additional grounds as he received the charge-sheet after filing of this revision petition.

Ld. SPP for CBN however opposed this ground and submitted that this revision petition is just for delaying the proceedings before Ld. trial court and on this ground, the revisionist sought adjournment from the Ld. trial court.

Considering the submissions, one last opportunity given for filing additional grounds today itself by the revisionist and list this revision petition for consideration on **02.09.2020**.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
ASJ/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

SC No. 8563/16
NCB Vs Nafe Singh & Ors.

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: None for NCB.

Accused Ashish is PO.

All accused are on bail but not present.

Sh S S Das, Ld. counsel for accused Diwakar Gupta through VC.

Pursuant to order dated 23.03.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi whereby the work in subordinate courts was suspended due to corona pandemic and the work was further suspended vide order dated 15.04.2020, 02.05.2020, 16.05.2020, 22.05.2020, 29.05.2020, 13.06.2020, 29.06.2020 and 14.07.2020.

This case was listed on 20.05.2020 for PE and was adjourned en bloc for 07.07.2020 and then for today i.e. 01.09.2020.

This matter is listed today for PE however the date of PE is prior to lockdown.

Ld. counsel for accused Diwakar Gupta filed an application which is listed for today submitting that interim order dated 14.03.2012 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi is still continuing and never been vacated. Ld. counsel submits that matter be fixed for further proceedings and not for PE however Ld. counsel for accused filed order sheets of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi till 26.07.2018 and submits that he will file thereafter also.

Accordingly, list this case for appearance of accused and further proceedings on 02.11.2020. Accused be informed about the next date of hearing through IO.

Copy of this order be sent to IO for compliance.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

**FIR No. 45/15
PS Spl Cell
U/s 21 NDPS Act
State Vs Uruakpa Ahmed @ Joseph Emeka**

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Ravindra Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State
through video conferencing.

Sh J S Kushwaha, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused Uruakpa
Ahmed @ Joseph Emeka through VC.

SI Satwinder on behalf of DCP, Spl Cell.

Ld. Addl. PP submits that he requires instructions from IO SI
Praveen.

Let IO SI Praveen be called for NDOH.

At request, list this application for **02.09.2020**.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi
District.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020**

SC No. 93/18
U/s 20 (C)/23/29 NDPS Act
NCB Vs Devender Sen & Ors.

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Mukesh Malik, Ld. SPP for NCB through video conferencing.
Sh Y K Saxena, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused Devender Sen through VC.

Ld. counsel for accused submits that applicant has granted interim bail by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Accordingly, at request, list this application for date already fixed i.e. **19.10.2020**.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi District.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

**FIR No. 40/15
PS Spl Cell
U/s 21, 22, 29, 61 NDPS Act
State Vs Rampal & Ors.**

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Ravindra Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State
through video conferencing.
Sh Shadman Ali, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused Shakir Ali
through VC.

Ld. counsel for accused submits that this accused vide order dated 31.07.2020 was granted interim bail by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi however while in custody, the accused was treated at hospitals namely G B Pant, LNJP, DDU and Safdarjung and his various tests, MRI were conducted there. Ld. counsel submits that for proper treatment, accused requires copy of medical documents of these hospitals. Accordingly, a report be called from jail superintendent for next date of hearing.

List this application for **05.09.2020**.

Copy of this order along with application be sent to jail superintendent for compliance.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi District.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020**

SC No. 156/2020
CBN Vs Rohit
File No. P&I/DEL/SEIZ/01/2020
U/s 21/22/28/29 & 30 NDPS Act

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh Satish Aggarwala, Ld. SPP for CBN through video conferencing.
Sh Rajiv Mohan, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant Rohit through VC.

Ld. counsel for accused submitted that this is an application for cancellation of NBWs issued vide order dated 23.07.2020. Ld. counsel submits that the applicant was on interim bail however vide order dated 10.07.2020, the application for extension of interim bail was dismissed and accused was granted one week's time to surrender. The accused went to jail authorities on 19.07.2020 but he was not allowed to surrender as suffering from fever. Ld. counsel submits that this court vide order dated 23.07.2020 on receiving the non surrender report from the jail after relying upon the order of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in case titled *Irshad Ali vs. State CrI.A 1157/2016 dated 17.07.2020* observed that there is no automatic extension of interim bail therefore issued the NBWs against accused and forfeited the surety bonds. Ld. counsel submits however the Full Bench of Delhi High Court in *WP (C) No. 3037/2020 titled as 'Courts on Its Own Motion Vs State & Ors' vide order dated 24.07.2020* categorically clarified that the persons on interim bail/parole either before or after 16.03.2020 shall extend automatically till 31.08.2020. Ld. counsel submits that therefore by implication of said order, despite dismissal of interim bail of accused, the accused is on interim bail. Hence, the order dated 23.07.2020 for issuance of NBWs and forfeiture of surety bonds be recalled.

Ld. SPP for CBN vide reply dated 10.08.2020 submitted that order dated 24.07.2020 does not come to rescue the applicant as he was not on interim bail on 13.07.2020 and interim bail has already been expired and he did not surrender despite the direction therefore the impugned order for forfeiture of surety and NBWs were issued against accused. It is also submitted that the applicant/accused had also lost his plea for extension of interim bail in Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and this fact is concealed by the accused in the present application. Ld. SPP also filed an application at around 8.30pm yesterday night through e-mail of this court on behalf of CBN to recall the interim order dated 27.07.2020 passed by this court for staying the NBWs and warrants of attachment. Ld. SPP again submits in this application that order dated 24.07.2020 could not rescue the present applicant and furthermore this applicant also concealed the factum of dismissal of application of interim bail by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi however Ld. counsel clarified that the application for interim bail was not dismissed by Hon'ble High Court but dismissed as withdrawn.

Heard. Record perused.

The main contention of Ld. SPP is that the accused was not on interim bail on 13.07.2020, furthermore, his application for interim bail is also dismissed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi though clarified to be dismissed as withdrawn, therefore the order dated 24.07.2020 of the Full Bench is not applicable. Hence this application is liable to be dismissed.

To deal with this submission, it is necessary to reproduce the relevant paras of order dated 17.07.2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in case titled *Manoj Kumar Das Vs State of Delhi, Bail Application no. 1357/2020* as under:-

12. The fact that the applicant moved two interim bail applications, viz. Bail Appl. Nos. 1357/2020 and 1613/2020, and in each case, counsel appearing for the applicant withdrew the bail applications vidé orders dated 02.07.2020 and 08.07.2020 is apparent from the record. Though the plea that, on each occasion, counsel was not instructed to

withdraw the interim bail applications is difficult to accept both on point of fact and on point of policy, this court is bound to fully comply with the letter and spirit of orders made by a Full Bench of this court in relation to extension of interim orders granted during the prevalent pandemic and lockdown.

13. Vidé order dated 01.07.2020 made in CrI. Appeal No. 193/2020, this court had referred certain queries to the Hon'ble Full Bench to consider and decide, for the guidance of all concerned. The queries were as follows:

“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 ?”

(emphasis supplied)

14. Answering the aforesaid queries vidé order dated 13.07.2020 in W.P.(C) No. 3037/2020 titled Court on its own Motion vs. State & Ors., the Full Bench headed by Hon'ble the Chief Justice has clarified, that in view of the serious threat of spread of the coronavirus pandemic in prison, where undertrials are on interim bail as on the date of that order, irrespective of whether they were released before or after 16.03.2020, such interim orders shall stand extended till 31.08.2020 on the same terms and conditions as were imposed earlier.

15. Regardless of the applicant's conduct, which of course deserves disapproval, applying the Full Bench's order to the applicant would mean that his interim bail would stand extended automatically by operation of the orders made by the Full Bench from time-to-time.

16. In these circumstances, regardless of the fact that the applicant ought to have surrendered in compliance of the interim bail orders granted to him from time-to-time but did not do so, the fact is that as per the Full Bench order dated

13.07.2020, today this court cannot ask the applicant to surrender to prison.

17. Mr. Tarang Srivastava, however expresses serious opposition on behalf of the State to the foregoing position, arguing that the Full Bench order cannot be construed to mean that even where a court, whether the High Court or a Subordinate Court, in exercise of its discretion and considering specific grounds, facts and circumstances of a given case, has granted interim bail to an undertrial for a specific period of time; and the undertrial on interim bail does not surrender in compliance with such orders, yet the undertrial would be entitled to the benefit of extension of interim bail as per the Full Bench orders.

18. Mr. Srivastava submits that this would undermine the discretion exercised by a court while granting interim bail and would give underserved benefit to undertrials.

19. **Be that as it may, query (b) above which was specifically placed before the Full Bench vidé order dated 01.07.2020 of this court, has been considered and answered by the Full Bench by its order dated 13.07.2020 ; whereby, it is clear that the reason for extension of interim bail is more a matter of policy to address the unprecedented and exceptional circumstances of the prevalent coronavirus pandemic. It is to guard the health of the inmates who remain in prison, as also to prevent further spread of the pandemic if those who are presently outside prison are allowed to return, that, even subordinating other legal principles, the Full Bench has mandated that inter alia in cases where undertrials are on interim bail as on the date of that order viz. 13.07.2020, such orders granting interim bail shall stand extended upto 31.08.2020 on the same terms and conditions as were imposed earlier.**

It is clear from the above case that despite non compliance of the orders of surrender of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi or Subordinate Courts extended the interim bail in terms of the order dated 13.07.2020 of Full Bench as a matter of policy. In another case titled '*Ganga Prasad @ Vicky Vs State*', *Bail Application no. 1831/2020 dated 07.08.2020*, the interim bail of accused was dismissed vide order dated 22.07.2020, however the accused had not surrendered and moved another application for interim

bail. Thereafter vide order dated 07.08.2020 the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi despite the order of dismissal again extended the interim bail in view of the order dated 13.07.2020 of Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. The relevant paras are reproduced as under:-

5. Thereafter, the applicant moved another application for extension of interim bail for a period of six weeks and vide order dated 22.07.2020, the same was dismissed. On the said date, the learned counsel for the applicant did not bring to the notice of this Court the directions passed by the Full Bench of this Court vide order dated 13.07.2020 in W.P.(C) 3037/2020 titled Court on its own motion vs. State & Ors. whereby it was clarified that the 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 and shall continue to remain on interim bail till 31.08.2020.

6. In view of the aforesaid directions, I hereby modify the order dated 22.07.2020 passed by this Court to the extent that the interim bail of the applicant is extended till 31.08.2020.

7. It is further made clear that if the aforesaid order passed by the Full Bench further continues to remain in force, the applicant shall remain on interim bail till then.

The Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 24.07.2020 have clarified that any accused granted interim bail/parole either before or after 16.03.2020, till date, shall automatically extended till 31.08.2020 which was again extended vide order dated 24.08.2020 till 31.10.2020. The relevant para of order dated 24.07.2020 is reproduced as under:

From a plain reading of the foregoing directions, it is axiomatic that, the Full Bench while taking suo motu cognizance of the extraordinary circumstances, arising out of the Covid-19 pandemic, had made it clear that insofar as, criminal matters are concerned, in view of the serious threat W.P.(C) 3037/2020 posed by the possibility of the unchecked spread of the coronavirus pandemic, by those who have been

*enlarged on interim bail/parole; and who may carry back with them the Covid-19 infection, so as to infect other inmates of the jail, if they are required to surrender, to the already congested and over-crowded jails, which may not be in a position to strictly maintain physical distancing amongst jail inmates; and considering the inherent vulnerability of the jails, owing to serious space constraints, to effectively control, check and prevent the spread of Covid-19; it was directed that, the interim bail/parole granted to **such persons by this Court or the Courts subordinate to this Court, either before or after the 16.03.2020, upto date, shall stand automatically extended till the 31.08.2020 or until further orders, except where there are any orders to the contrary, passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in any particular matter, during the intervening period. It is further clarified that this order of extension of interim bail/parole shall be applicable to all under trials/convicts, who have been enlarged on interim bail or parole, as on date, irrespective of the fact that they were so released on interim bail/parole, before or after 16.03.2020.***

Considering the mandate of above orders, it is clear that despite dismissal of interim bail vide order dated 10.07.2020, it stands automatically extended till 31.08.2020 and now till 31.10.2020. Hence, the impugned order dated 23.07.2020 of issuance of NBWs and forfeiture of surety passed by this court stand recalled.

Application disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given dasti.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi District.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

SC No. 321/19
FIR No. 09/19
PS Spl Cell
U/s 22/29 NDPS Act
State Vs Sunil Kumar & Ors.

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Ravindra Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State through video conferencing.

Ms Sushma Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Rajesh Dutta @ Raj through VC.

Ld. Counsel for accused submitted that this is an application for cancellation of NBW and forfeiture of surety bonds as directed by this court vide order dated 20.07.2020. Ld. counsel submits that this accused was granted interim bail vide order dated 06.03.2020 by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and his extension of interim bail filed before Roster Judge at Patiala House Courts, Delhi was dismissed as withdrawn however it was observed by Roster Judge that said bail is automatically extended in terms of order dated 25.03.2020 in *WP (C) No. 3037/2020 titled as 'Courts on Its Own Motion Vs State & Ors'*. Ld. counsel submits that furthermore Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 24.07.2020 have clarified that all the interim bails which was granted either before or after 16.03.2020 shall extend automatically till 31.08.2020 which was again extended vide order dated 24.08.2020 till 31.10.2020. Ld. counsel submits that in view of these judgments, the order dated 20.07.2020 for issuance of NBW and forfeiture of surety bonds stand recalled.

Ld. Addl. PP for the State also acceded that all the interim bails got extended in terms of order of Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. Accordingly, in view of the submissions and considering the mandate of orders dated 24.07.2020 & 24.08.2020 in *WP (C) No. 3037/2020 titled as 'Courts on Its Own Motion Vs State & Ors'*, the order dated 20.07.2020 of

issuance of NBWs and forfeiture of surety passed by this court stand recalled.

Application disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given dasti.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi

District.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

SC No. 152/2020

NCB Vs Kingsley Ekechukwu @ Amukamara

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Mukesh Malik, Ld. SPP for NCB through video conferencing.

Accused Kingsley Ekechukwu @ Amukamara is in Jail no. 10, Rohini, Delhi and produced through VC.

Sh R D Tyagi, Ld. counsel for accused Kingsley Ekechukwu @ Amukamara through VC.

Accused submitted that counsel Sh R D Tyagi is not his counsel and his counsel is some Mr Gupta however Sh R D Tyagi submits that he is engaged by his brother and requested some time to file his vakalatnama.

Notice has already been issued to accused over application for sending the samples for retesting.

List this matter for reply/arguments on this application on **09.09.2020**. Jail superintendent is directed to produce the accused Kingsley Ekechukwu @ Amukamara through VC at 11am on said date.

Copy of the order be given dasti as well as sent to accused in jail no. 10, Rohini jail, Delhi.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi District.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

**FIR No. 37/15
PS Crime Branch
State Vs Sachin Kumar & Ors.**

01.09.2020

Matter heard through video conferencing.

Present: Sh. Ravindra Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State
through video conferencing.

Today matter is listed for consideration on non surrender report however it is reported that interim bail of this accused has already been extended till 31.10.2020, therefore, no further directions required on this non surrender report.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi District.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020**

FIR No. 52/2013
PS Spl Cell
State Vs Vinod Kumar & Ors.

01.09.2020

File taken up on being presented by Ahlmad.

Present: Sh. Ravindra Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State
through video conferencing.

Ahlmad submits that in pursuance to order dated 26.08.2020, the statements u/s 313 CrPC of accused persons namely Moosa Koya KP, Ummar Farook Badaje and Vinod Kumar were sent to jail. Statements of accused persons namely Moosa Koya KP, Ummar Farook Badaje have been received back after their signatures duly attested by jail superintendent but statement u/s 313 CrPC of accused Vinod Kumar not received back. Ahlmad further submits that inadvertently the next date of hearing mentioned as 04.06.2020 whereas it should be 04.09.2020.

After perusing the order dated 26.08.2020, it is noticed that inadvertently the date of final arguments mentioned as 04.06.2020 however it should be 04.09.2020. Jail superintendent is also directed to send the statement u/s 313 CrPC of accused Vinod Kumar in sealed envelope after obtaining his signature under attestation on each and every page on or before the next date of hearing.

List the matter for **final arguments on 04.09.2020**. Jail superintendents are also directed to produce accused persons namely Moosa Koya KP, Ummar Farook Badaje and Vinod Kumar through VC on said date at 11am. Copy of this order be sent to respective jail superintendents for compliance.

Copy of the order be uploaded on the website of New Delhi District.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Spl. Judge, NDPS/N. Delhi
01.09.2020

NCB Vs. Tshanda Kapinga Wadi
Case NO. SC/305/2019

01.09.2020

Present: Ms. Katyayini Ld. Counsels for applicant/accused Tshanda
Kapinga Wadi alongwith surety Shiv Kumari.

Ld. Counsel for accused presented the bail bond and submitted that accused is granted interim bail for eight weeks by the hon'ble High Court vide order dated 13.08.2020 in Bail Application No. 2031/2020 upon furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount. Ld. Counsel submits that certified copy is not available and filed the internet copy of the order. Same is also verified by the Asstt. Ahlmad through internet.

Bail bond presented and accepted in terms of order dated 13.08.2020 of hon'ble High Court. The FDR of Rs. 25,000/- retained. Concern Bank be intimated not to encash the same without permission of this court.

Ahlmad is directed to prepare the release warrant. Accused is directed to comply the order dated 13.08.2020 of hon'ble High Court.

Order be uploaded on Delhi District Courts website.

(Ajay Kumar Jain)
Special Judge-NDPS
New Delhi/01.09.2020