

E-FIR No. 11109/20
State Vs. Sameer
U/s 379/411 of IPC
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020


(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

Present: Ld. APP for the State

None.

As per reply to the bail application filed by the IO, given FIR number has not been registered at PS Nihal Vihar. Accordingly, the present bail application stands dismissed.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

FIR No. 605/20
State Vs. Sameer
U/s 186/356/379/34 of IPC
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

Present: Ld. APP for the State

Sh. Mehmood Hussain , Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused

Arguments heard on the bail application moved on behalf of the applicant/accused. It is stated that the accused is falsely implicated in the present case.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the charge sheet in the present case is not filed within the statutory period of 60 days in view of the Section 167 of Cr.P.C., accordingly, the accused Sameer is hereby released on bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- and one surety of the like amount.

E-Copy of this order be sent to the jail Supdt. Concerned and also be supplied to Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

PANKAJ ARORA Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:23:13 +05'30'

(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

FIR No. 393/14
State Vs. Anil Mathur
U/s 392/394/411 of IPC
PS: Maya Puri
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

Present: Ld. APP for the State

Sh. Jitender Kumar, Ld. LAC for the applicant/accused

Arguments heard on the bail application moved on behalf of the applicant/accused. It is stated that the accused is falsely implicated in the present case.

Bail application not is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the accused has suffered incarceration in JC for about 7 months & half month, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC. Accordingly, the Anil Mathur is hereby released on bail on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- and one surety of the like amount.

E-Copy of this order be sent to the jail Supdt. Concerned and also be supplied to Ld. LAC for the applicant/accused.

PANKAJ ARORA Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:25:53 +05'30'
(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

FIR No. 476/20
State Vs. Arjun @ Mota
U/s 379/411 of IPC
PS: NIhal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

Present: Ld. APP for the State

Sh. P.K. Garg, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused

Arguments heard on the bail application moved on behalf of the applicant/accused. It is stated that the accused is falsely implicated in the present case.

Bail application is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

Previous bail application has already been dismissed by this court vide order dated 01.10.2020.

There is an allegation against the accused that he was caught red handed while stealing the mobile phone from the pocket of the complainant at the spot. The accused is already involved in six other similar criminal cases. The allegations are serious in nature in nature. No ground is made out for grant of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the present bail application stands dismissed.

E-Copy of this order be supplied to Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

PANKAJ ARORA Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:27:19 +05'30'
(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

FIR No. 572/20
State Vs. Ranjeet @ Chela
U/s 356/379/188/411 of IPC
PS: NIhal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

Present: Ld. APP for the State


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

Arguments heard on the bail application moved on behalf of the applicant/accused. It is stated that the accused is falsely implicated in the present case.

Bail application not is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected and investigation 'qua' the applicant/accused is complete, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC. Accordingly, the Ranjeet @ Chela is hereby released on bail on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- and one surety of the like amount.

E-Copy of this order be sent to the jail Supdt. Concerned and also be supplied to Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

PANKAJ ARORA  Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:27:47 +05'30'
(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

E-FIR No. 11725/19
State Vs. Amarjeet Singh
U/s 411 of IPC
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

Present: Ld. APP for the State

Sh. Mahender Singh , Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused

Arguments heard on the bail application moved on behalf of the applicant/accused. It is stated that the accused is falsely implicated in the present case.

Bail application not is opposed by Ld. APP for the State.

As the alleged recovery has already been effected, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the accused in JC. Accordingly, the Amarjeet Singh is hereby released on bail on her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- and one surety of the like amount.

E-Copy of this order be sent to the jail Supdt. Concerned and also be supplied to Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

PANKAJ ARORA Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:28:19 +05'30'
(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

E-FIR No. 668/20
PS: Nihal Vihar
14.10.2020


(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

Present: Ld. APP for the State

None.

As per the reply filed by the IO, TIP Proceeding of the articles is yet to be conducted. Accordingly, application for releasing the articles on superdari stands dismissed.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 72881/16
FIR No. 393/14
State Vs. Anil Mathur
PS: Maya Puri
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Accused produced from JC through VC.

Sh. Jitender Kumar, Ld. LAC for the accused.

Let the previous order be complied with afresh for
03.11.2020.

Accused be produced for rehnumai after every 14 days.



(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 5962/18
FIR No. 0093/18
State Vs. Manish @ Neppu
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.


No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Issue court notice to the accused as well as to his surety for NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused and further proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 6134/19
FIR No. 900/16
State Vs. Ashish
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.


**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Issue court notice to the accused as well as to his surety for
NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused and arguments on
charge on 17.12.2020.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 8484/19
FIR No. 698/18
State Vs. Surender @ Sikki
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.


No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Issue court notice to the accused as well as to his surety for NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused and further proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 1087/20
FIR No. 208/19
State Vs. Mamta
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

Put up for further proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 2165/20
FIR No. 146/18
State Vs. Sonu
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.


No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

Put up for further proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 2472/20
FIR No. 266/19
State Vs. Baski Chaudhary Etc.
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

I take cognizance of offence.

Issue summons to the accused persons and notice to their respective sureties through the IO concerned for NDOH.

IO shall remain present in person in the event of non-execution of process on NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused persons and further proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(PankajArora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 2476/20
FIR No. 406/19
State Vs. Mustakeen
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Some clarification is required from the IO concerned. Issue summons to the IO concerned for NDOH.

Put up for further proceedings on 20.11.2020.



(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No.3409/20
FIR No. 669/20
State Vs. Sandeep Jha
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Accused is stated to be in JC but he is not produced from JC.

It is recommended that Sh. Jitender Kumar, Ld. Remand Advocate be appointed as LAC to assist the accused.

Issue production warrant of the accused for his production through VC for NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused and further proceedings on 06.11.2020. Accused be produced from JC after every 14 days.

Copy of this order be sent to Ld. Secretary, DLSA, West, THC for information.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 3485/20
FIR No. 290/20
State Vs.Sagar
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


Accused is stated to be in JC but he is not produced from JC.

It is recommended that Sh. Jitender Kumar, Ld. Remand Advocate be appointed as LAC to assist the accused.

Issue production warrant of the accused for his production through VC for NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused and further proceedings on 06.11.2020. Accused be produced from JC after every 14 days.

Copy of this order be sent to Ld. Secretary, DLSA, West, THC for information.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 345/17
FIR No. 296/14
State Vs. Sagar ETC
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.


No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Issue court notice to the accused persons as well as to their respective sureties for NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused persons and further proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(PankajArora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 1224/19
FIR No.682/18
State Vs. Shivam
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Issue court notice to the accused as well as to his surety for NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused and further proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 5301/19
FIR No. 121/19
State Vs. Sanjeet Singh @ Kake
PS: Maya Puri
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.


**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

Issue court notice to the accused as well as to his surety
for NDOH.

Put up for appearance of the accused and further
proceedings on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 2388/20
FIR No. 176/20
State Vs. Jitender Sharma @ Sonu Etc.
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Kaushal Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the accused Deep Narayan through VC.

All the accused persons in person (physically present in the court today).

It is submitted by the accused persons that they have already received the legible copy of charge-sheet.

As offence under Section 392/397/336/411/34 of IPC is triable by Court of Sessions, the present case is hereby committed to the Court of Sessions. The accused persons are directed to appear before Ld. Principal District Judge, West, THC, Delhi through VC on 23.10.2020 at 2.00 p.m.

The Ahlmad is directed to send the file complete in all respects to the Court of Ld. District Judge, West, THC, Delhi.


(PankajArora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 70724/16
FIR No. 32/16
PS: Maya Puri
State Vs. Parvesh
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 11.12.2020.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 70280/16
FIR No. 24/10
PS: Maya Puri
State Vs. Sanjay Batra Etc.
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 18.12.2020.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 63041/16
FIR No. 97/11
PS: Maya Puri
State Vs. Ram Kumar Pandey
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


Sh. Ratnesh Rajmurti, Ld. Counsel for the accused.

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 18.12.2020.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 64143/16
FIR No. 289/14
PS: Maya Puri
State Vs. Kimti Lal
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 71572/16
FIR No.285/14
PS: Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Akashdeep @ Ashu Etc.
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 2932/17
FIR No. 765/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Sunil Kumar Etc.
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 3724/17
FIR No. 99/17
PS: Maya Puri
State Vs. Nitin Kumar
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 1095/18
FIR No. 01/18
PS: Maya Puri
State Vs.Sanju Bala
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 5215/18
FIR No. 175/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Sonu
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 5964/18
FIR No. 0339/18
PS: Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Deepak Kumar
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 179/19
FIR No. 353/18
PS: Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Jitender Kumar
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.

None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 2752/19
R.K. Oberoi Vs. Aruna Sharma
PS: Nihal Vihar
16.10.2020

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING

URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.


Present: None for the complainant.

None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

Put up for CE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

ID No. 1878/19
FIR No. 05/19
PS: Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Sachin @ Haddi
16.10.2020

**(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH CISCO WEBEX MEETING
URL <https://delhidistricts.webex.com/join/mm03west>)**

File taken up for the first time after COVID-19 lockdown.

**No adverse order is being passed in non-urgent cases in view of
letter no. 249/RG/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.**

Present: Ld. APP for the State.


None for the accused person(s).

As per office order no. 26/DHC/2020 of the Hon'ble High
Court of Delhi, evidence cannot be recorded in the present
case.

Previous order, passed before commencement of COVID-
19 lockdown, be complied with afresh for NDOH.

RPWs be summoned for NDOH.

Put up for PE on 29.01.2021.



(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03(West)/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

In the court of Sh. Pankaj Arora, MM-03 (West), THC, Delhi

CC No. 527/20
PS NihalVihar
16.10.2020

Rekha Nara
Vs.
Preeti

Present: Sh. Naseem Akhtar, Ld. Counsel for the complainant.
Arguments heard.
Put up for orders at 4.00 PM.


(PANKAJ ARORA)
M.M-03 (West), THC, Delhi
16.10.2020

At 4.00 p.m.

Present: None.

By this order I shall dispose off an application U/s 156(3) Cr. P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant/complainant thereby seeking directions to register an FIR.

Brief facts of the present case as stated by the complainant are that in the second week of November, 2018, the accused approached the friend of the complainant, namely Smt. Neelam, W/o Sh. Sanjay Kumar, R/o RZD-77, Nihal Vihar, Nangloi, Delhi-41, who was also very well acquainted with the accused and the accused to the said friend of the complainant that she was in dire need of some money in connection with her business purposes and hence, she requested to Smt. Neelam to lend her some monetary help to the tune of Rs. 1,40,000/-. However, the said Smt. Neelam expressed her



helplessness, nonetheless, she confided to the accused that she knew a lady, who was her very close friend and who can help her and with whom she can facilitate a meeting in that regard.

It is further stated that thereby, on 15.11.2018, the said Smt. Neelam facilitated a meeting with the accused and the complainant at the residence of the complainant, wherein the said Smt. Neelam introduced the accused to the complainant as one of her close friend and she further apprised to the complainant regarding the intent and purpose of the visit of the accused. After some deliberations, Smt. Neelam asked and recommended to the complainant to lend to the accused a monetary help to the tune of Rs. 1,40,000/- as a friendly loan and the accused assured and promised to the complainant that she would return the said friendly loan to her account within six months.

It is further stated that on the recommendation of the afore-named Smt. Neelam, the complainant withdrew an amount of Rs. 1,50,000/- from her bank account and lent to the accused an amount of Rs. 1,40,000/- in cash on 16.11.2018 at her residence, and against the lending of the said friendly loan, a deed of loan agreement dated 26.11.2018 was got prepared and executed between the accused and the complainant on a non-judicial stamp paper and at the same time, the accused has also tendered to the complainant two post-dated cheques, bearing Nos. 347801 and 347802, both dated 10.05.2019, for an amount of Rs. 70,000/- each, drawn on SBI, Branch, Guru Harikrishan Nagar, New Delhi-110041 and the said cheques were duly signed by the accused.

It is further stated that at the time of handing over the above said cheques to the complainant, the accused fully guaranteed to the complainant that the same shall be honoured, when it would be presented for its encashment on the date as mentioned in the said cheques, as the accused



would arrange sufficient funds in her account by that time and the complainant, believing in the assurance and promises made by the accused, accepted the said cheques.

It is further stated that the said Smt. Neelam expressed her wish and desire that her name, too, should appear in the above said deed of Loan Agreement as a formal party, since the above said friendly loan was lent by the complainant to the accused on her recommendation only and that the complainant, too, had honoured her said recommendation by keeping a faith and trust upon her. The period of said friendly loan was inadvertently got mentioned in the above said deed of Loan Agreement as 4 months, instead of 6 months, agreed by the accused and the complainant initially, which came into the knowledge of the complainant only after few days of execution of the above said deed of Loan Agreement and thereby, the complainant immediately apprised to the accused and her said friend Smt. Neelam with regard to the said fact.

It is further stated that when the said cheques got matured, the complainant apprised to the accused that she was going to present the said cheques with her banker for encashment and after getting the nod from the accused, the complainant presented the said cheques with her banker, Indian Overseas Bank, Paschim Vihar, New Delhi for encashment, however, the the said cheques were returned unpaid with the reason for return mentioned in the memo dated 24.05.2019 as, "Account closed".

It is further stated that the complainant got the information from her banker regarding the dishonor of the said cheques, she along with her said friend Smt. Neelam, immediately approached the accused and when she apprised her regarding the dishonor of the said cheques, the accused told to the complainant that due to some technical mistakes on the part of her banker, her account might have been closed and hence, the accused apologized to



the complainant and her friend Smt. Neelam and she requested them to grant her at least one month's time to rectify the same from her banker and asked the complainant to present the said cheques again with her banker during the end of the month of June, 2019 and thus, the complainant had no option at that moment, other than that to believe in the words of the accused and wait for one more month.

It is further stated that on 29.06.2019, the complainant re-presented the said cheques with her said banker for encashment, however, to her utter shock and surprise, the said cheques were again returned unpaid with the reason for return mentioned in the memo, dated 02.07.2019 as, "Account closed" and the moment the complainant got the information from her banker regarding the dishonor of the said cheques, she and her friend Smt. Neelam immediately approached the accused and asked her to repay the entire amount of the said friendly loan immediately to the complainant in cash, however, to the utter shock and dismay of the complainant and her friend Smt. Neelam, the accused behaved with the complainant in a very rude manner and also threatened her with dire consequences if she ever demanded the said amount from her and hence, the complainant had no option, other than to take the shelter of the law of the land and to serve the accused with statutory notice dated 10.07.2019 .

As per the ATR filed by the IO, it is stated that the dispute is of civil nature.

Here it is relevant to look into the judgment of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the moremater of **Sh. Subhakaran Luharuka Vs. State Cr.M.L NOS. 6122-23/2005 and 6133-34/2005**, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi circulated the following guidelines for the Magistrates dealing with the application under Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C.:

"1. Whenever a Magistrate is called upon to pass orders under Section

156(3) of the Code, at the outset, the Magistrate should ensure that before coming to the Court, the complainant did approach the police officer in charge of the police station having jurisdiction over the area for recording the information available with him disclosing the commission of a cognizable offence by the person/persons arrayed as an accused in the complainant. It should also be examined what action was taken by the SHO, or even by the senior officer of the police, when approached by the complainant under Section 154(3) of the Code.

2. The Magistrate should then form his own opinion whether the facts mentioned in the complaint disclose commission of cognizable offences by the accused persons arrayed in the complaint which can be tried in his jurisdiction. He should also satisfy himself about the need for investigation by the police in the matter. A preliminary enquiry as this is permissible even by an SHO and if no such enquiry has been done by the SHO, then it is all the more necessary for the Magistrate to consider all these factors. For that purpose, the Magistrate must apply his mind and such application of mind should be reflected in the Order passed by him.

Upon a preliminary satisfaction, unless there are exceptional circumstances to be recorded in writing, a status report by the police is to be called for before passing final orders.

3. The Magistrate, when approached with a complaint under Section 200 of the Code, should invariably proceed under Chapter XV by taking cognizance of the complaint, recording evidence and then deciding the question of issuance of process to the accused. In that case also, the Magistrate is fully entitled to postpone the process if it is felt that there is a necessity to call for a police report under Section 202 of the Code.

4. Of course, it is open to the Magistrate to proceed under Chapter XII of the Code when an application under Section 156(3) of the Code is also filed along with a complaint under Section 200 of the Code if the Magistrate


decides not to take cognizance of the complaint. However, in that case, the Magistrate, before passing any order to proceed under Chapter XII, should not only satisfy himself about the pre requisites as aforesaid, but, additionally, he should also be satisfied that it is necessary to direct police investigation in the matter for collection of evidence which is neither in the possession of the complainant nor can be produced by the witnesses on being summoned by the Court at the instance of complainant, and the matter is such which calls for investigation by a State agency. The Magistrate must pass an order giving cogent reason as to why he intends to proceed under Chapter XII instead of Chapter XV of the Code.”

This Court has heard the arguments & perused the record.

It is observed that all the documents and evidence are in custody of the complainant and nothing is out of reach of the complainant which requires special investigation through Police. This court is also of the considered view that the complainant is well within the power and in possession of the documents/material/evidence required to prove her case by adducing evidence.

Accordingly, the application of the complainant under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C is accordingly dismissed. The complainant is given opportunity to prove his case by adducing C.E.

Put up for CE on 29.01.2021.


(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03 West/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

This is an application for releasing the mobile phone on Superdari.

Present:- Ld. APP for the State.
Ld. Counsel for the applicant.
IO has filed his reply. Taken on record.

Instead of releasing the vehicle on superdari, I am of the considered view that the vehicle has to be released as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **Sunder Bhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujrat, AIR 2003 SC 638** wherein it has been held that

Vehicles involved in an offence may be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle, valuation report, and a security bond.

69. The photographs of the vehicle should be attested countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

70. The production of the vehicle should not be insisted upon during the trial. The panchnama and photographs along with the valuation report should suffice for the purposes of evidence.

71. Return of vehicles and permission for sale thereof should be the general norm rather than the exception.

72. If the vehicle is insured, the court shall issue notice to the owner and the insurance company for disposal of the vehicle. If there is no response or the owner declines to take the vehicle or informs that it has claimed insurance/released its right in the vehicle to the insurance company and the insurance company fails to take possession of the vehicle, the vehicle may be ordered to be sold in auction.

73. If a vehicle is reply not claimed by the accused, owner, or the insurance company or by a third person, it may be ordered to be sold by auction."

The view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been reiterated by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled as **Manjit Singh Vs. State in CrI. M.C. No. 4485/2013 dated 10.09.2014.**

Considering the facts and circumstances and law laid down by higher courts, mobile phone in question be released to the **owner as per the invoice, after due identity and IMEI number verification** on furnishing security bond as per valuation report of the vehicle. After preparation of panchnama of the vehicle and furnishing of security bond as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court, the mobile phone shall be released by the IO.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to applicant.

Panchnama and valuation report shall be filed in the court within one month.

PANKAJ ARORA

Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:29:21 +05'30'

(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03/West/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

This is an application for releasing vehicle bearing no. DL-4SCK-7894 on Superdari.

Present:- Ld. APP for the State.
Ld. Counsel for the applicant
IO has filed his reply. Taken on record.

Instead of releasing the vehicle on superdari, I am of the considered view that the vehicle has to be released as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **Sunder Bhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujrat, AIR 2003 SC 638** wherein it has been held that

Vehicles involved in an offence may be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle, valuation report, and a security bond.

69. The photographs of the vehicle should be attested countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

70. The production of the vehicle should not be insisted upon during the trial. The panchnama and photographs along with the valuation report should suffice for the purposes of evidence.

71. Return of vehicles and permission for sale thereof should be the general norm rather than the exception.

72. If the vehicle is insured, the court shall issue notice to the owner and the insurance company for disposal of the vehicle. If there is no response or the owner declines to take the vehicle or informs that it has claimed insurance/released its right in the vehicle to the insurance company and the insurance company fails to take possession of the vehicle, the vehicle may be ordered to be sold in auction.

73. If a vehicle is reply not claimed by the accused, owner, or the insurance company or by a third person, it may be ordered to be sold by auction."

The view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been reiterated by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled as **Manjit Singh Vs. State in CrI. M.C. No. 4485/2013 dated 10.09.2014.**

Considering the facts and circumstances and law laid down by higher courts, vehicle in question bearing registration no. **DL-4SCK-7894** be released to the **registered owner after due identity verification** on furnishing security bond as per valuation report of the vehicle. After preparation of panchnama of the vehicle and furnishing of security bond as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court, the vehicle shall be released by the IO.

Copy of this order be given dasti to applicant.

Panchnama and valuation report shall be filed in the court within one month..

PANKAJ ARORA Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:29:47 +05'30'
(Pankaj Arora)
MM-03/West/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020

This is an application for releasing vehicle bearing no. DL-8SAL-3516 on Superdari.

Present:- Ld. APP for the State.
Ms. Aashi Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the applicant
IO has filed his reply. Taken on record.

Instead of releasing the vehicle on superdari, I am of the considered view that the vehicle has to be released as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **Sunder Bhai Ambalal Desai Vs. State of Gujrat, AIR 2003 SC 638** wherein it has been held that

Vehicles involved in an offence may be released to the rightful owner after preparing detailed panchnama; taking photographs of the vehicle, valuation report, and a security bond.

69. The photographs of the vehicle should be attested countersigned by the complainant, accused as well as by the person to whom the custody is handed over.

70. The production of the vehicle should not be insisted upon during the trial. The panchnama and photographs along with the valuation report should suffice for the purposes of evidence.

71. Return of vehicles and permission for sale thereof should be the general norm rather than the exception.

72. If the vehicle is insured, the court shall issue notice to the owner and the insurance company for disposal of the vehicle. If there is no response or the owner declines to take the vehicle or informs that it has claimed insurance/released its right in the vehicle to the insurance company and the insurance company fails to take possession of the vehicle, the vehicle may be ordered to be sold in auction.

73. If a vehicle is reply not claimed by the accused, owner, or the insurance company or by a third person, it may be ordered to be sold by auction.”

The view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been reiterated by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled as **Manjit Singh Vs. State in CrI. M.C. No. 4485/2013 dated 10.09.2014.**

Considering the facts and circumstances and law laid down by higher courts, vehicle in question bearing registration no. **DL-8SAL-3516** be released to the **registered owner after due identity verification** on furnishing security bond as per valuation report of the vehicle. After preparation of panchnama of the vehicle and furnishing of security bond as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court, the vehicle shall be released by the IO.

Copy of this order be given dasti to applicant.

Panchnama and valuation report shall be filed in the court within one month..

PANKAJ ARORA

Digitally signed by PANKAJ
ARORA
Date: 2020.10.16 15:30:24 +05'30'

(Pankaj Arora)

MM-03/West/THC/Delhi
16.10.2020