

**Bail Application No.851/20**  
**State Vs. Jayant Kumar Jain**  
**FIR No.53/19**  
**U/s. 409/467/468/471/120B IPC**  
**PS : EOW**

**05.08.2020**

*Vide order No. 7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7070/7159/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today to hear and dispose of fresh bail/urgent criminal applications and pending bail applications pertaining to New Delhi District Sessions Division.*

**Present :** Sh. Anshul Mittal, Ld. Proxy Counsel on behalf of main Ld. Counsel Sh.

Sunil Kumar Mittal for applicant/accused Jayant Kumar Jain.

Sh. S.K. Tripathi, Ld. Addl. PP for State. (through Video Conferencing).

Sh. Sanjeev Sahai and Sh. Gagan Kataria, Ld. Counsels for complainant  
(through Video Conferencing).

IO/Insp. Rajneesh Kumar.

E-reply of Insp. Rajneesh Kumar has been filed.

Heard. Perused.

Due to personal reasons, I do not want to hear and decide this bail application. Accordingly the bail application be put up before Ld. District & Sessions Judge, PHC, New Delhi today itself with the request to transfer it to some other Court or for appropriate orders.

Ahlmad is directed to send the bail application file to the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, PHC, New Delhi immediately.

It is certified that video conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**(Ashutosh Kumar)**  
**Roster Judge/ASJ-01/Special Court**  
**POCSO/ NDD/PHC/ND/05.08.2020/D**

:1:

**Bail Application No.911/2020**  
**State Vs. Arun Rathi**  
**FIR No.149/2020**  
**U/s. 420/34 IPC**  
**PS : Vasant Kunj (South)**

**05.08.2020**

*Vide order No. 7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7070/7159/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today to hear and dispose of fresh bail/urgent criminal applications and pending bail applications pertaining to New Delhi District Sessions Division.*

**Present :** Sh.Tanmay Mehta, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused (through Video Conferencing)

Sh. S.K. Tripathi, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video Conferencing)

Heard. Perused.

IO SI Mukesh Kumar is present and has filed further status report and at request of ld. Counsel for the applicant, E-copy of reply be supplied to him.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant has submitted that inadvertently the pendency of other criminal cases against the applicant was not mentioned in the original bail application and that list of said cases stands mentioned in para no.3 of the additional affidavit, already filed on record.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant has submitted that the next date fixed before the mediation centre is 17.08.2020 and some progress towards compromise has been made and has requested that a date after 17.08.2020 may be fixed before this court and interim order may be extended. Ordered accordingly. Dasti if desired.

Contd....2

:2:

Re-notify on 22.08.2020.

It is certified that video conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**(Ashutosh Kumar)**  
**Roster Judge**  
**ASJ-01/Special Court**  
**POCSO/ NDD/PHC/ND/05.08.2020/HS**

**Bail Application No.910/2020**  
**State Vs. Uma Rathi**  
**FIR No.149/2020**  
**U/s. 420/34 IPC**  
**PS : Vasant Kunj (South)**

**05.08.2020**

*Vide order No. 7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7070/7159/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today to hear and dispose of fresh bail/urgent criminal applications and pending bail applications pertaining to New Delhi District Sessions Division.*

**Present :** Sh.Tanmay Mehta, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused (through Video Conferencing)

Sh. S.K. Tripathi, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video Conferencing)

Heard. Perused.

IO SI Mukesh Kumar is present and has filed further status report and at request of ld. Counsel for the applicant, E-copy of reply be supplied to him.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant has submitted that the next date fixed before the mediation centre is 17.08.2020 and some progress towards compromise has been made and has requested that a date after 17.08.2020 may be fixed before this court and interim order may be extended. Ordered accordingly. Dasti if desired.

Re-notify on 22.08.2020.

It is certified that video conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**(Ashutosh Kumar)**  
**Roster Judge**  
**ASJ-01/Special Court**  
**POCSO/ NDD/PHC/ND/05.08.2020/HS**

:1:

**Bail Application No.429/2020**  
**State Vs. Shahnawaz & Ors.**  
**FIR No.20/2020**  
**U/s. 308/34 IPC**  
**PS : Kishangarh**

**05.08.2020**

*Vide order No. 7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7070/7159/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today to hear and dispose of fresh bail/urgent criminal applications and pending bail applications pertaining to New Delhi District Sessions Division.*

**Present :** Sh. Rohit Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused (through Video Conferencing)

Sh. S.K. Tripathi, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video Conferencing)

E-reply of IO has been filed.

Heard. Perused.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant has drawn my attention to page no.8 to 10 of the paper book to submit that the same is settlement deed qua settlement of dispute relating to the present case FIR and has submitted that joint quashing petition for quashing of the present FIR was listed before Delhi High Court on 24.03.2020 and thereafter due to COVID-19 Pandemic, next date in the said matter has not been fixed. He has further submitted that in case court notice is issued to the complainant, he will confirm the factum of said settlement.

Issue E-notice to complainant through IO to join the hearing through video conferencing.

E-notice be also issued to IO to file the further status report and to join the hearing through video conferencing.

:2:

E-copy of this order be also served upon the DCP concerned to ensure compliance.

Re-notify on 07.08.2020.

It is certified that video conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**(Ashutosh Kumar)**  
**Roster Judge**  
**ASJ-01/Special Court**  
**POCSO/ NDD/PHC/ND/05.08.2020/HS**

**Bail Application No.3915/18**  
**State Vs. Nandita Kumar**  
**FIR No.129/16**  
**U/s. 307/380/411/403/120B/201/34 IPC & 66 IT Act**  
**PS : B.K. Road**

**05.08.2020**

*Vide order No. 7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7070/7159/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.07.2020 of Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi District, New Delhi, the undersigned has been deputed for duty today to hear and dispose of fresh bail/urgent criminal applications and pending bail applications pertaining to New Delhi District Sessions Division.*

**This is an application u/s 439 (2) Cr.P.C. moved by the applicant/State for cancellation of bail granted to the accused Nandita Kumar vide order dated 09.08.2018 of Sh. Satish Kumar Arora, the then Ld. ASJ, PHC, New Delhi.**

**Present :** Sh. Irfan Ahmed, Ld. Special PP for applicant/State.

Sh. Maninder Singh, Ld. Counsel for non-applicant/accused Nandita Kumar (through Video Conferencing).

IO/Insp. C.L. Meena.

Heard. Perused.

Ld. Special PP for State has submitted that the chargesheet against two of the main accused Syed Mohd. Imran and Kasmir Thomas is almost ready and will be filed soon but has submitted that the chargesheet against non-applicant Nandita Kumar cannot be filed as she is not co-operating in the investigation and has not handed over the mobile phone, laptop and did not allow the search of her house from where recovery of stolen jewellery and valuables could have been effected.

Ld. Counsel for non-applicant has submitted that the CD qua the alleged obstruction by the non-applicant during search of her house has been filed on record and the matter requires playing of the said CD in the Court and physical hearing in the Court.

In case the chargesheet against aforesaid two other accused persons is filed, the said file be requisitioned for NDOH.

Re-notify on **07.09.2020**.

It is certified that video conferencing was held in an uninterrupted manner and during the proceedings, no objections were raised regarding the connectivity i.e. audio or visual quality.

**(Ashutosh Kumar)**  
**Roster Judge/ASJ-01/Special Court**  
**POCSO/ NDD/PHC/ND/05.08.2020/D**

**FIR No. 09/2019**  
**PS Special Cell**  
**State Vs. Sunil Kumar @ Raju & Ors.**

05.08.2020

Present: Sh. Ravinder Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

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

SI Punit Grewal.

This is an application for providing tower location charts of mobile numbers and status of supplementary chargesheet.

Ld. Addl. PP submits that the CDRs of mobile numbers have already been filed however IO present in the court undertakes to supply the tower location chart also by next date of hearing. IO further submits that some more time is required to file supplementary chargesheet.

Accordingly, list this application for supplying tower location chart for 20.08.2020. Order be uploaded on Delhi District Courts website.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)**  
Special Judge-NDPS  
New Delhi/05.08.2020

**FIR No. 57/2019**  
**PS Special Cell**  
**State Vs Hasim @ Neta**  
**U/s 21/29/61/85 NDPS Act**

05.08.2020

Vide this order, is shall dispose of the application seeking regular bail u/s 439 Cr.PC moved on behalf of applicant/accused Hasim @ Neta.

Ld. Counsel for accused submitted that there is no recovery from present accused and present accused is involved in offence u/s 29 NDPS Act only on the basis of call conversation however, the transcripts of call intercepted qua the present applicant noway even remotely connects the present applicant with dealing of narcotic substances. Furthermore, the mobile number alleged to be of the accused is also not recovered. Ld. Counsel submits that there is no other admissible evidence on record to connect the accused with present offence. The disclosure statement of accused cannot be used against the present accused. Bar u/s 37 NDPS Act also not applicable as the accused is found to have committed the offence u/s 29 NDPS Act only. Ld. Counsel submits that in similar facts and circumstances Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in case titled Mukesh Vs. State Bail application no. 1345/2020 dated 08.07.2020 and Bharat Sharma Vs. State bail application no. 1045/2019 dated 19.08.2019 have granted bail to the accused persons. Ld. Counsel for accused submitted that present accused is in custody since 06.04.2019 therefore, be released on bail.

Ld. Addl. PP for the State submits that on secret information, accused Mohd. Sufiyan and Mohd. Ismail were apprehended and from the search of bag of accused Mohd. Sufiyan 11 kg of heroin was recovered and from the search of black polythene of Mohd. Ismail 14 kg of heroin was recovered and 25 kg more was recovered from the car and in total 50 kg was recovered. Both these accused disclosed that they had brought 50 kg of heroin from one Kabir of Manipur on the directions of co-accused Manoj and present accused Hasim @ Neta resident Amethi. On the basis of their statement, accused Manoj Kumar Das was apprehended who disclosed that he used to procure heroin from one Kabir and

Salim both resident of Manipur in partnership with present accused Hasim @ Neta. Thereafter on secret information on 06.04.2019, accused Hasim @ Neta was apprehended however nothing was recovered from him. He also disclosed that he used to procure the heroin from Kabir and Salim of Manipur in partnership with accused Manoj resident of Barauni, Bihar through his contacts Mohd. Sufiyan and Mohd. Ismail. There are many incriminating voice calls of accused persons including the present accused intercepted in Special Cell regarding the drug trafficking. Monitoring of interception revealed that accused persons were communicating with each other and their associates in code words. These incriminating voice calls among the members of narcotics syndicates are stored in computer system installed in the offence of Special Cell, voice samples have already been sent however result awaited. Ld. Addl. PP submits that all the mandatory provisions of NDPS Act were duly complied. The disclosure statement and CDR connectivity of accused persons categorically shows their overwhelming interactions. The conversation of intercepted call categorically shows they were communicating about drugs in code words. Ld. Addl. PP submits that the entire narcotic syndicate is involved and there is heavy recovery of 50 kg of heroin in present case. As there is recovery of commercial quantity, thus definite bar u/s 37 NDPS Act over the release of accused on bail.

Heard. Record perused.

Apex Court in *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Kajad*, (2001) 7 SCC 673, the Court while taking note of Section 37 of the Act held that "negation of bail is the rule and its grant an exception under Section 37 of the Act and for granting the bail the Court must, on the basis of the record produced before it, be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the offences with which he is charged and further that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail".

The position stands reiterated in *Sami Ullaha v. Superintendent, Narcotic Central Bureau*, (2008) 16 SCC and *Union of India v. Rattan Mallik alias Habul*, (2009) 2 SCC 624 wherein the Apex Court further clarified that when a prosecution/conviction is for an offence under a special statute and that statute

contains specific provisions for dealing with matters arising thereunder, including an application for grant of bail, such provisions cannot be ignored while dealing with such an application and observed that :

*"9. The broad principles which should weigh with the Court in granting bail in a non-bailable offence have been enumerated in a catena of decisions of this Court and, therefore, for the sake of brevity, we do not propose to reiterate the same. However, when a prosecution/conviction is for offence(s) under a special statute and that statute contains specific provisions for dealing with matters arising thereunder, including an application for grant of bail, these provisions cannot be ignored while dealing with such an application."*

Apex Court in case titled *State of Kerala Vs. Rajesh Crl. Appeal No. 154-157/2020 dated 24.01.2020* observed as under:

*18. The jurisdiction of the Court to grant bail is circumscribed by the provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. It can be granted in case there are reasonable grounds for believing that accused is not guilty of such offence, and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. It is the mandate of the legislature which is required to be followed. At this juncture, a reference to Section 37 of the Act is apposite. That provision makes the offences under the Act cognizable and nonbailable. It reads thus:*

*"37. Offences to be cognizable and nonbailable.—(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974),—*

*(a) every offence punishable under this Act shall be cognizable;*

*(b) no person accused of an offence punishable for [offences under section 19 or section 24 or section 27A and also for offences involving commercial quantity] shall be released on bail or on his own bond unless—*

*(i) the Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for such release, and*

*(ii) where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.*

*(2) The limitations on granting of bail specified in clause (b) of subsection (1) are in addition to the limitations under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), or any other law for the time being in force on granting of bail." (emphasis supplied)*

19. This Court has laid down broad parameters to be followed while considering the application for bail moved by the accused involved in offences under NDPS Act. In *Union of India Vs. Ram Samujh and Ors.* 1999(9) SCC 429, it has been elaborated as under:

*“7. It is to be borne in mind that the aforesaid legislative mandate is required to be adhered to and followed. It should be borne in mind that in a murder case, the accused commits murder of one or two persons, while those persons who are dealing in narcotic drugs are instrumental in causing death or in inflicting deathblow to a number of innocent young victims, who are vulnerable; it causes deleterious effects and a deadly impact on the society; they are a hazard to the society; even if they are released temporarily, in all probability, they would continue their nefarious activities of trafficking and/or dealing in intoxicants clandestinely. Reason may be large stake and illegal profit involved. This Court, dealing with the contention with regard to punishment under the NDPS Act, has succinctly observed about the adverse effect of such activities in *Durand Didier v. Chief Secy., Union Territory of Goa [(1990) 1 SCC 95]* as under:*

*24. With deep concern, we may point out that the organised activities of the underworld and the clandestine smuggling of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances into this country and illegal trafficking in such drugs and substances have led to drug addiction among a sizeable section of the public, particularly the adolescents and students of both sexes and the menace has assumed serious and alarming proportions in the recent years. Therefore, in order to effectively control and eradicate this proliferating and booming devastating menace, causing deleterious effects and deadly impact on the society as a whole, Parliament in its wisdom, has made effective provisions by introducing this Act 81 of 1985 specifying mandatory minimum imprisonment and fine.*

**8. To check the menace of dangerous drugs flooding the market, Parliament has provided that the person accused of offences under the NDPS Act should not be released on bail during trial unless the mandatory conditions provided in Section 37, namely,**

*(i) there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence; and*

*(ii) that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail are satisfied. The High Court has not given any justifiable reason for not abiding by the aforesaid mandate while ordering the release of the respondent accused on bail. Instead*

*of attempting to take a holistic view of the harmful socio-economic consequences and health hazards which would accompany trafficking illegally in dangerous drugs, the court should implement the law in the spirit with which Parliament, after due deliberation, has amended.”*

**20. The scheme of Section 37 reveals that the exercise of power to grant bail is not only subject to the limitations contained under Section 439 of the CrPC, but is also subject to the limitation placed by Section 37 which commences with nonobstante clause. The operative part of the said section is in the negative form prescribing the enlargement of bail to any person accused of commission of an offence under the Act, unless twin conditions are satisfied. The first condition is that the prosecution must be given an opportunity to oppose the application; and the second, is that the Court must be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence. If either of these two conditions is not satisfied, the ban for granting bail operates.**

**21. The expression “reasonable grounds” means something more than prima facie grounds. It contemplates substantial probable causes for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. The reasonable belief contemplated in the provision requires existence of such facts and circumstances as are sufficient in themselves to justify satisfaction that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. In the case on hand, the High Court seems to have completely overlooked the underlying object of Section 37 that in addition to the limitations provided under the CrPC, or any other law for the time being in force, regulating the grant of bail, its liberal approach in the matter of bail under the NDPS Act is indeed uncalled for.**

**22. We may further like to observe that the learned Single Judge has failed to record a finding mandated under Section 37 of the NDPS Act which is a sine qua non for granting bail to the accused under the NDPS Act.**

**23. The submission made by learned counsel for the respondents that in Crime No. 14/2018, the bail has been granted to the other accused persons(A1 to A4), and no steps have been taken by the prosecution to challenge the grant of postarrest bail to the other accused persons, is of no consequence for the reason that the consideration prevailed upon the Court to grant bail to the other accused persons will not absolve the act of the accused respondent(A5) from the rigour of Section 37 of the NDPS Act.**

There is a huge amount of commercial quantity of 50 kg of Heroin is recovered from the co-accused persons in this case and there is a definite bar u/s

37 of NDPS Act over releasing on bail. The present accused is found well connected with co-accused persons as clear from the CDRs. The conversations with co-accused clearly appears cryptic suggesting that interacting about the contraband in code words. In view of above judgments negation of bail is a rule and grant is exception u/s 37 of the Act and the court must be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that accused is not guilty of the offences with which he is charged and further that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. The overwhelming conversations between the accused and the cryptic nature of conversation categorically suggests prima facie involvement of this accused. Furthermore, Delhi High Court in case titled *S.K. Jain Vs. M.G. Attri Crl. Rev. 518/2007 dated 02.05.2012* held that when there is a recovery of foreign currency from co-accused and the relationship has been admitted, then at the stage of charge, the evidence cannot be dissected. It is well settled that in case of conspiracy if there is reasonable ground to believe that two or more persons have conspired together to commit an offence by virtue of section 10 of Evidence Act, anything said, done or written by one of such person in reference to their common intention, is a relevant fact as against each other believed to be so conspiring. In present case also, besides the disclosure statement, the accused were also found connected through mobile conversations and CDRs. Therefore at this stage, it cannot be held that this material cannot be looked into. Furthermore, it cannot be inferred at this stage there are reasonable ground to believe that accused is not guilty of the offence and is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. Considering the material on record and in view of above discussion, I found no ground to release the applicant/accused Hasim @ Neta on bail. Hence the present application is dismissed.

It is clarified that nothing in this order shall prejudice the case on merits. Application disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given dasti as well as be sent to accused in jail. Order be uploaded on Delhi District Courts website.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)**  
Special Judge-NDPS  
New Delhi/05.08.2020

**NCB Vs. Abdul Rehman @ Dablu**  
**NCB case No. VIII/15/DZU/2016**

05.08.2020

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

Sh. Nitin Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Abdul Rehman @  
Dablu through VC.

Ld. Counsel submitted that this is an application for extension of interim bail on the ground that the condition of accused is not well and also in view of order dated 24.07.2020 of Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court.

Ld. Addl. PP however opposed the bail application.

Heard. Considering the Full Bench order of Hon'ble Delhi High Court dated 24.07.2020 in W.P.(C) 3037/2020 whereby all the accused persons who are on interim bail, their interim bail is automatically extended till 31.08.2020, the interim bail of accused Abdul Rehman is extended till 31.08.2020 on the same terms and conditions. Application disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given dasti. Order be uploaded on Delhi District Courts website.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)**  
Special Judge-NDPS  
New Delhi/05.08.2020

**FIR No. 37/2015  
PS Crime Branch  
State Vs. Manjeet**

05.08.2020

Present: Sh. Ravinder Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. Nitin Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Manjeet through  
VC.

Ld. Counsel submitted that this is an application for extension of bail till 31.08.2020 in view of the order dated 24.07.2020 of Full Bench of Hon'ble Delhi High Court.

Ld. Addl. PP however opposed the bail application on the ground that this bail was taken on the ground of surgery of the wife of accused however wife of accused even not approached the hospital on the date of surgery. Ld. Addl. PP submits that the accused is applying malafide tactics to obtain interim bail.

Heard. Considering the Full Bench order of Hon'ble Delhi High Court dated 24.07.2020 in W.P.(C) 3037/2020 whereby all the accused persons who are on interim bail, their interim bail is automatically extended till 31.08.2020, the interim bail of accused Manjeet is extended till 31.08.2020 on the same terms and conditions. Application disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given dasti. Order be uploaded on Delhi District Courts website.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)**  
Special Judge-NDPS  
New Delhi/05.08.2020

**NCB Vs. Noorzai Gul Amin**  
**Case No. SC/57/2020**

05.08.2020

Present: Sh. P.C. Aggarwal, SPP for NCB through VC.

Sh. Jivesh Kumar Tiwari, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Noorzai Gul Amin through VC.

Ld. SPP requests some more time to file reply.

Last and final opportunity given. List this application for reply and arguments on 13.08.2020. Order be uploaded on Delhi District Courts website.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)**  
Special Judge-NDPS  
New Delhi/05.08.2020

**FIR No. 25/2016**  
**PS Special Cell**  
**State Vs. Shariyat Ali @ Mulla & Ors.**

05.08.2020

Present: Sh. Ravinder Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. Rajesh Kaushik, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Ishrar Ahmad  
@ Pahadi through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the accused submitted that accused is suffering from  
asthma as well as infection in lungs therefore, a report be called from jail.

Accordingly, the Jail Superintendent is directed to file report over the  
medical condition of this accused.

List this application on 10.08.2020. Order be uploaded on Delhi  
District Courts website.

**(Ajay Kumar Jain)**  
Special Judge-NDPS  
New Delhi/05.08.2020