

Bail Application No. 1080/20
State Vs. Sunita Golcha
FIR No.488/20
U/s. 406/420/34 IPC
PS : Vasant Kunj (S)

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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 : None for applicant/accused Sunita Golcha.
Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video conferencing).

The matter is fixed order on the anticipatory bail application as arguments were heard on 27.08.2020.

ORDER:-

1. Ld. Counsel for applicant had drawn my attention to the relevant part of copy of the FIR at page number 18 of the paper book to submit that the complainant has claimed himself to be a resident of Vasant Kunj and working in Hero Motocorp Ltd., Rewari, Haryana whereas in the Pronote dated 18.03.2019 (at page number 16 of the paper book) executed by the applicant in favour of the complainant, the address of the complainant is mentioned to be of Rewari, Haryana whereas the address of applicant is mentioned to be of East Patel Nagar, New Delhi. He has submitted that 18.03.2019 was a working day being Monday and the office of the complainant i.e. Hero Motocorp Ltd. at

Rewari was functional and thus the said Pronote could not have been signed in Vasant Kunj but was signed at Rewari only. He has further submitted that the applicant was a resident of Rewari at the time of the transaction, which is clear from his address of Rewari mentioned in the Pronote but has deliberately and malafidely falsely claimed himself to be a resident of Vasant Kunj in the FIR, to make the territorial jurisdiction of the PS Vasant Kunj (S). On merits, he has submitted that Section 406/420 IPC are anti-thesis and both the offences cannot co-exist together and have been wrongly invoked by the investigating agency. He has further submitted that from the allegations, no deception or misrepresentation or dishonest intention can be attributed to the applicant. He has also submitted that misrepresentation, dishonest intention or deception had to be there from the very start to make it a case of cheating. He had further drawn my attention to the FIR to submit that as per the complainant, accused no.3 Mr. Kunal Golchha @ Goldy approached him on behalf of the proprietorship concern 'Forever Jewels' (of which the applicant was the proprietor) for loan of Rs.50 lakh on the pretext of advancement of family business of 'Forever Jewels' and accordingly said loan was given by the complainant by mean of 2 cheques of Rs.25 lakh each, for a period of one year on 9% interest per annum. He has further submitted that even as per complainant, no inducement, assurance or promise was made by the applicant at the time of advancement of the loan. He has further submitted that as per FIR, at the time of receiving the loan, towards repayment of loan, accused no.3 Kunal Golchha @ Goldy had handed over two duly filled in account payee post dated cheques of 'Forever Jewels' signed by the applicant (accused no.1) and Mr. Vinod Golchha (accused no.2) in favour of complainant. He has also submitted that as per the claim of complainant, in second week of June 2019 on the asking of Kunal Golchha @ Goldy, the complainant on 15.06.2019 at his

residence had handed over further loan by cheque of Rs.20 lakh on interest @ 9% p.a. to 'Forever Jewels' and loan was to be repaid on 18.09.2020, qua which applicant issued post dated cheque of Rs.20 lakh from the account of 'Forever Jewels'. He had also submitted that had there been any kind of misrepresentation, deception or dishonest intention on the part of the applicant, the complainant would not have extended the second loan. He had also submitted that once interest of Rs.1,01,250/- in 3 EMIs for the period April 2019 to June 2019 was paid on the earlier loan of Rs.50 lakh and inspite of that the complainant was under the wrong impression that the applicant had cheated him, then there was no reason or occasion for complainant to extend the second loan and from the same it is clear that a civil transaction has been falsely converted a case u/s 406/420 IPC without there being any of the essential ingredients of the said offences. He had further submitted that the complainant has admitted that further total interest of Rs.1,41,750/- was paid for the period of July 2019 to September 2019 in 3 EMIs (qua both the loans). He had also argued that the complainant had no money lending license and was not legally competent to give the two loans to the applicant on interest. He had also submitted that since it is a State case, therefore Ld. Counsel for complainant has no right to address the Court at this stage of arguments on the bail application but at the most he can assist the Ld. Addl. PP. He had further submitted that the applicant is a senior citizen and a woman. He had accordingly prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant. In support of his arguments, Ld. Counsel for applicant had sent list of following judgments but during the course of arguments has referred to only two judgments of 'M/s. M.B. Footwear Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. M/s. R.K. Sales' and 'G. Sagar Suri & Anr. Vs. State of UP & Ors.'

- (i) Criminal Appeal No.1135/2009 titled as 'Dalip Kaur & Ors. Vs. Jagnar Singh & Anr.' by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.
- (ii) Appeal (crl.) No.91/2000 titled as 'G. Sagar Suri & Anr. Vs. State of UP & Ors.' by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.
- (iii) Criminal Writ Petition No.581/2007 titled as 'M/s. M.B. Footwear Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. M/s. R.K. Sales of Hon'ble Bombay High Court.
- (iv) Criminal Petition No.557/2013 titled as 'Shri Debabrata Phukan Vs. The State of Assam' by Hon'ble Gauhati High Court.
- (v) Crl. Misc. No.M-1203/14 titled as 'Ramesh Vs. State of Haryana' by Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana.
- (vi) CWP No.20199/2010 titled as 'Mrs. Madhu Khanna Vs. Union of India and Ors. by Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana.
- (vii) Crl.M.C. No.1243/17 titled as 'Kailash Agarwal Vs. State of NCT of Delhi & Anr. & Crl. M.C. No.1246/17 titled as 'Subhash Agarwal Vs. State of NCT of Delhi & Anr.' by Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana.
- (viii) Crl. O.P.Nos.20946, 20991 and 20992/2007 & M.P. Nos.1+1+1 of 2007 titled as 'Pale Horse Designs & Anr. Vs. Natarajan Ratham' by Hon'ble Madras High Court.

2. Per contra, Ld. Addl. PP has submitted that the Ld. Counsel for

the applicant has admitted the financial transactions. He has also submitted that case is at the initial stage of investigation and that Sections 406/420 IPC can be invoked alternatively. He has also stated that if there is intention to repay the loan amount then Section 406 IPC will be attracted and if there was no intention to repay the amount, then Section 420 IPC will be made out. He has further submitted that in the said Pronote it is not mentioned as to where it was executed. He has also submitted that in the FIR, the complainant has mentioned his address to be of Vasant Kunj and that one cheque of Rs.20 lakh given by the applicant towards repayment of one of the loan, had bounced in the bank of the complainant situated in the area of PS Vasant Kunj (S) and thus as per Section 178 Cr.P.C., PS Vasant Kunj (S) has territorial jurisdiction to investigate the matter. He has further submitted that the first installment of interest towards loan was made by the applicant as a bait and to induce the complainant to advance second loan, which was indeed advanced and then some interest was also paid on the second loan also to induce the complainant to advance further loan but the applicant could not succeed in her further design. He has further submitted that once the installments towards repayment were stopped, intention to deceive on the part of the applicant can be inferred. He has also submitted that since the cheque given by the applicant had bounced, therefore it can be inferred from the catena of judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court that if the applicant had no intention to pay while drawing the advance cheque, which is the case herein, then Section 420 IPC will be attracted. He has further submitted that the purpose of anticipatory bail is to avoid false implication and humiliation of an innocent person but when prima facie case is made out in this matter, police has right to investigate and granting of anticipatory bail will hamper the probe. He has further submitted that as per report of IO, 7 other similar complaints were made to PS Karol Bagh against the accused persons by

different victims, which have been transferred to EOW. However he has admitted that the Ld. Counsel for the complainant has no independent right to address the Court. He has prayed for rejection of the bail application.

3. In support of his submissions, Ld. Counsel for complainant has relied upon order passed in Bail Application No. 1491/2015 titled as 'Dr. Rajesh J. Aeren Vs. State (NCT of Delhi)' of Hon'ble Delhi High Court [2016 SCC Online Del 2086 : (2016) 3 DLT (CrI) 867]

4. During the course of arguments, Ld. Counsel for the applicant has not disputed the advancement of aforesaid loans by the complainant (through cheques) on interest to 'Forever Jewels' of which the applicant was the proprietor. Although there is allegation that another accused gave the assurances but from the FIR, it is clear that the said assurances were given in the presence of the applicant also and the loan amount cheques were handed over in her presence and she was beneficiary of the said cheque amounts. Merely by payment of initial interest through few EMIs qua the two loans, would not make it a civil dispute only. It is very much possible that to gain confidence of a lender, a borrower may pay some installments towards interest to take further loan, which can be the case in this matter also. No doubt the dishonest intention and causing of wrongful loss to the complainant and wrongful gain to the herself had to be there at the time of transaction but the same can be inferred by the assurances made at the time of transactions in the presence of the applicant and the subsequent conduct including non-payment of further interest EMIs. As per FIR, the second loan amount cheque of Rs.20 lakh was handed over by the complainant to the co-accused Kunal Golchha (accused no.3) in the presence of applicant (accused no.1) at his residence at Vasant Kunj. Also one cheque given by the applicant towards repayment of one of the

loan amount of Rs.20 lakh had bounced in the bank of the complainant situated at Vasant Kunj. In the Pronote it is specifically not mentioned that as to where the said loan was advanced or the Pronote was executed. As per Section 178 Cr.P.C., prima facie PS Vasant Kunj (S) has territorial jurisdiction. Thus it cannot be said at this stage that the complainant is indulging in forum hunting. As regards the rights of Ld.Counsel for complainant, no doubt there is no absolute right of Ld. Counsel to address the Court but he can assist Ld. Addl. PP but there are no fetters on the powers of the Court to hear any person connected with any case at any stage of the proceedings to arrive at just decision.

5. Prima facie, I find force in the submissions of Ld. Addl. PP for State. The judgments cited by Ld. Counsel for the accused do not help his case or make the applicant entitled for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances, in view of aforesaid discussion, the nature of the offences & alleged role of the applicant, I am of the considered opinion that this is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant as thorough investigation by the police is necessary to complete the sequence of events and to collect evidence. Accordingly the present application is dismissed. Dasti to all concerned.

7. Bail application file be consigned to record room.

8. This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conferencing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge/ASJ/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/D

Bail Application No.1679/2020
State Vs. Santosh Kumar
FIR No. 38/2020
U/s.498A/306/34 IPC
PS : Tughlak Road

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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 : Ms. Santosh Mishra and Sh. Rudra Pratap, Ld. Counsels for applicant/accused Santosh Kumar.

Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video conferencing).

IO/SI Ranjeet Singh from P.S. Tughlak Road.

Heard. Perused.

IO has submitted that he has already filed *challan* by e-mode and that he shall file physical copy of the *challan* before concerned Ld. MM today itself.

Ld. Counsel for applicant has submitted that she shall appear before concerned Ld. MM today itself and obtain the copies of the

Contd.....2

-2-

same. In case the charge-sheet is filed, the same be summoned for next date.

Re-notify on **01.09.2020**.

This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conference hearing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge
ASJ-01/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/A

Bail Application No.1744/20
State Vs. Insar Khan
FIR No. 106/2020
U/s. 468/471/120B IPC
PS : Crime Branch

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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. Rajpal Kasana and Ms. Palak Munjal, Ld. Counsels for applicant/ accused Insar Khan @ Kallu (through Video conferencing).

Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video conferencing).

Reply under the signature of IO/SI Ajay Kumar from P.S. Crime Branch has been filed.

Heard. Perused.

IO has stated that one pistol, one spare magazine and five live cartridges were recovered from the possession of the applicant. IO has admitted that the applicant is in custody since 04.08.2020, was taken into six days police custody remand and investigation from the applicant is complete as of now,

Contd.....2

applicant is a government servant and one of the co-accused Paras Chopra has already granted bail.

Ld. Addl. PP for the State has submitted that one of the co-accused Deepak @ Furlila is absconder, investigation is at initial stage and the applicant was involved in case FIR no. 103/2012 U/s 420/467/468/471 IPC of P.S. Ameenabad, Luncknow, UP. He has accordingly prayed for rejection of the bail of the applicant.

Considering the totality of the facts & circumstances, specially in view of the facts that, alleged recovery has already been effected, the applicant is in custody since 04.08.2020 and was taken in 6 days PC remand, investigation from the applicant is complete now, the co-accused Paras Chopra is on bail and that the applicant is a Government servant, **the applicant/accused Insar Khan** is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- with **two** surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Ld. MM/Duty MM/Link MM. However, applicant is directed not to try to influence the witness or temper with evidence and in case it is prima facie brought to the notice of the Court that the applicant is violating the said terms, his bail will be liable to be canceled.

The bail application is accordingly disposed of. Dasti to all concerned.

E-copy of this order be also sent to the applicant/accused through concerned Jail Superintendent as well as to the concerned Ld. MM/Duty

Cond.....3

-3-

MM/Link MM for information.

Bail application file be consigned to record room.

This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conference hearing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge
ASJ-01/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/A

Bail Application No.270/2020
Shiv Khera Vs. Pankaj Dayal
FIR No. 673/2014
U/s. 420/406/34 IPC
PS : Economic Offences Wing

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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. Chetan Roy, Ld. Counsel for applicant/complainant Shiv Khera (through Video conferencing).
Sh. Amit Khanna, Ld. Counsel for non-applicant/accused Pankaj Dayal (through Video conferencing).
Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video conferencing).
IO/Insp. Vijay Kumar from P.S. EOW (through Video conferencing).

Heard. Perused.

In view of the conflicting claims of Ld. Counsel for applicant/complainant and Ld. Counsel for the non-applicant/accused, IO is directed to verify as to whether the conditions imposed in the interim bail order dated 08.01.2019 of the non-applicant/accused have been complied by him. In this regard the applicant/complainant and non-applicant/accused shall

Contd.....2

-2-

co-operate with IO and furnish requisite information and documents whenever asked. The State to also make its stand clear as to whether it is supporting the application or opposing the same.

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

Dasti to all concerned.

Re-notify on **03.09.2020**.

This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conference hearing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge
ASJ-01/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/A

Bail Application No.1743/20220
State Vs. Raghbir Singh
FIR No. 268/18
U/s. 420/468/471/34 IPC
PS : Vasant Kunj (S)

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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. Prashant Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused Raghbir Singh (through Video conferencing).

Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video conferencing).

E-reply of IO/SI Bhagwan Singh from P.S. Vasant Kunj (S) has been filed.

Heard. Perused.

At the request of Ld. Counsel for applicant, issue e-notice to IO to supply e-copy of FIR and status report on furnishing of e-mail address by Ld. Counsel for applicant, who shall co-ordinate in this regard with the IO and IO is also directed to appear in person on the next date of hearing.

Issue e-notice to IO/SHO to file further status report as to what is the admissible material available against the applicant, what further material is

Contd.....2

-2-

to be collected and also on what point custodial interrogation of the applicant is required (since IO has claimed that custodial interrogation is required).

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

Dasti to all concerned.

Re-notify the anticipatory bail application on **01.09.2020**.

This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conference hearing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge
ASJ-01/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/A

**(1) Bail Application No. 1654/19
State Vs. Pankaj Sarin**

**(2) Bail Application No.1599/19
State Vs. Pavan Sarin**

**(3) Bail Application No.1678/19
State Vs. Deepak Sarin
FIR No.91/18
U/s. 420/467/468/471/120B IPC
PS : Chanakya Puri**

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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. Amit Sharma, Sh. Anurag Ahulwalia and Sh. Akash Nagar,
Ld. Counsels for applicants/accused Pavan Sarin, Deepak Sarin
and Pankaj Sarin (through Video conferencing).

Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video
conferencing).

Sh. Mohit Mathur, Ld. Senior Advocate with Ld. Counsel Sh.
Gurmehar Sistani for the proposed buyer Captain Amarjeet Sethi
(through Video Conferencing).

Sh. Ashutosh Dubey, Ld. Counsel for Vijay Chhabra.

IO/SI Aaditya Sharma is present and has filed further status
report under his signature.

Heard. Perused.

At request, e-copy of the said status report be supplied to the Ld. Counsel for all other sides.

In view of order dated 24.08.2020 in W.P.(C) No.3037/2020 titled as '*Court on its own motion Vs. State & Ors.*' of Hon'ble Delhi High Court, the interim protection granted to the applicants namely **Pavan Sarin, Deepak Sarin and Pankaj Sarin** stands extended till 31.10.2020. Dasti to all concerned.

IO to appear in person with further status report on NDOH.

Re-notify on **29.10.2020**.

This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conference hearing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge/ASJ/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/D

Bail Application No. 1746/20
State Vs. Nosa Tony Lawani
FIR No.675/19
U/s. 420/467/468/471/120B IPC & 14 Foreigners Act
PS : Vasant Kunj (S)

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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. Anoop Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused
Nosa Tony Lawani (through Video conferencing).

Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video conferencing).

SI Sandeep Suthar, Cyber Cell, SWD is present in person and has filed reply under his signature.

Heard. Perused.

IO has submitted that 17 cloned/forged debit/credit cards of other persons (including 9 international cards and 8 Indian bank cards) were recovered from the possession of the applicant. He has further submitted that one chargesheet in the matter has been filed. He has also stated that after filing of the chargesheet, one victim has come forward who has suffered loss of Rs.30,000/- as his debit card of Axis Bank was cloned and misused and the said cloned/forged card is part of the aforesaid 17 cards recovered from the possession of the applicant. He has also submitted that the cards were deposited

in the FSL for expert opinion in January 2020 and the report is yet to be received.

IO has also submitted that he shall expeditiously file the supplementary chargesheet mentioning the aforesaid loss to the victim and the FSL result (if obtained) within one week.

At the request of IO, issue e-notice to the Director concerned, FSL, Delhi to provide FSL result of this case before NDOH.

The chargesheet file and the supplementary chargesheet (if filed) be summoned for NDOH.

Re-notify on **09.09.2020**. IO to appear in person on NDOH.

This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conference hearing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge/ASJ/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/D

Bail Application No. 1745/20
State Vs. Rohtash Kumar
FIR No.363/20
U/s. 323/341/354/354B/506/508/34 IPC
PS : Kishangarh

28.08.2020

Vide order No.7921-8010/Bail & Filing/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and in continuation of earlier office order No.7380-7469/Judl./D&SJ/NDD/2020 dated 31.07.2020 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. M. Kaushik, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Rohtash Kumar (through Video conferencing).

Sh. Kumar Sanjay, Ld. Addl. PP for State (through Video conferencing).

E-reply of IO/SI Vikram has been filed.

Heard. Perused.

While refuting the allegations levelled, Ld. Counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant is the father-in-law of the complainant and he is 85% handicapped and that the false complaint has been made as a result of matrimonial dispute of the complainant.

In the reply of the IO, it is mentioned that there is no requirement of arrest and custodial interrogation of the applicant.

In view of the aforesaid and in the facts and circumstances, it is ordered that in the event of arrest, applicant/accused Rohtash Kumar shall be

-2-

released on bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of IO/SHO concerned. However applicant is directed to join investigation as and when directed by IO & thoroughly cooperate in the case.

Application is disposed of accordingly. Dasti to all concerned.

Bail application file be consigned to the Record Room.

This Court is satisfied qua audio & video connectivity of the video conference hearing.

(Ashutosh Kumar)
Roster Judge/ASJ/Special Court POCSO
NDD/PHC/ND/28.08.2020/D