IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. Kasim @ Sahil
FIR No. : 353/20
P.S.: Kirti Nagar
U/s. : 356/379/411 IPC

03.09.2020

Bail application is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 546/13785-13810/Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'ble District Judge (West).

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Sunil Tomar, Ld. Counsel for the accused.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.
IO SI Suresh Chand.

Arguments on the bail application heard.

Ld. Addl. PP for the State on instructions submits that the address of the aunt has been verified, however, accused was apprehended from the spot and was sitting as a pillion rider.

Ld. Counsel for the accused submits that accused did not do anything, it was the driver of the mother cycle who had committed the offence and as such accused/applicant has no role to play.

On consideration of facts and circumstances accused was apprehended at the spot by public as they had fallen down from their scooty after some distance. Stolen mobile phone has been recovered.

I thus, find no ground to admit the accused on bail. Application stands dismissed.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. ANKUR JAIN
ASJ-01, SPECIAL FAST TRACK COURT (WEST):TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI

Bail application no. 1732
FIR No :60/20
PS: Mundka
STATE VS. Pankaj @ Cheetah @ Sattu
U/s 302/34 IPC & 25/27/54/59 Arms Act

03.09.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State .
Mr. A. K. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused.
SI Naveen Malik, Special Staff Outer District.

Copy of the charge sheet is received. Arguments heard. After hearing arguments Ld. Counsel for accused seeks liberty to withdraw the present bail application. Statement of the Ld. Counsel for the accused is recorded separately. In view of the statement the present bail application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file a fresh. Incharge Outer District is directed to expedite the CFSL / FSL report and shall positively file a report within 4 weeks before the concerned Court of Ms. Babita Puniya, Ld. MM with respect to the status of the CFSL/FSL report. Copy of order be given Dasti to the Ld. Counsel for accused as well as to the IO.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

Bail application no. 1732
FIR No :60/20
PS: Mundka
STATE VS. Pankaj @ Cheetah @ Sattu
U/s 302/34 IPC & 25/54/59 Arms Act

Mr. A. K. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for accused, Enrollment no. D-862/91.

Without Oath

I may be permitted to withdraw the present bail application with liberty to file the fresh.

RO&AC

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. ANKUR JAIN
ASJ-01, SPECIAL FAST TRACK COURT (WEST):TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI

FIR No :165/2020
PS: Anand Parbat
STATE VS. Om Prakash @ Omi
U/s 394/397 IPC

03.09.2020

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State .
Mr. Akhil Tarun Goyal, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused.

After hearing arguments Ld. Counsel for accused seeks liberty to withdraw the present bail application with liberty to file a fresh. Statement of the Ld. Counsel for the accused is recorded separately. In view of the statement the present bail application is dismissed as withdrawn.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

FIR No :165/2020
PS: Anand Parbat
STATE VS. Om Prakash @ Omi
U/s 394/397 IPC

Mr. Akhil Tarun Goyal, Ld. Counsel for accused, Enrollment no. D-1988/18.

Without Oath

I may be permitted to withdraw the present bail application with liberty to file a fresh.

RO&AC

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

I withdrew this Bail Application Accused D/1988/18 Dated 3/9/20

IN THE COURT OF SH. ANKUR JAIN
ASJ-01, SPECIAL FAST TRACK COURT (WEST):TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI

State Vs. Rashid
FIR No. : 157/2020
PS : Ranhola
U/s : 4 Muslim Women Protection of the Right, 2019

03.09.2020

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Mr. Vikas Kumar Shukla, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused.
IO in person.
Complainant with her father.

IO submits that he identifies the complainant. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submits that interim order be granted as matter has been settled with the complainant. Complainant submits that entire amount has not been received by her and post dated cheques have been given. Once the settled amount has not been given, no question of interim protection is made out. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused request for adjournment.

At his request adjourned. Put up on 30.09.2020.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. Vikram Saini & Ors.
FIR No. : 25/20
P.S.: Anand Parbat
U/s. : 302/364/120B IPC

THROUGH CISCO WEB EX.

03.09.2020

File is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 543/13554-13638/Misc./Gaz./DJ West/Delhi/2020 dated 29.08.2020 and No. 417/RG/DHC/2020 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Atul Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the accused Vikram Saini.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

File perused. Arguments heard.

Put up for order.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

ORDER:-

By this order I shall decide the second bail application filed on behalf of the applicant Vikram Saini.

Brief facts of the case are that information was received in the from Lady LHMC Hospital regarding one patient who was brought dead. DD no. 4A was handed over to HC Praveen Singh who went to the

hospital and came to know that one person was brought in the hospital and was declared dead. The deceased was identified as Kunal aged about 16 years.

Ld. Counsel for the accused has argued that he is not going to the merits of the case and is seeking interim bail on the ground of illness of wife. He submits that treatment papers of the wife have been duly verified by the police official. It is also argued that a case of POCSO has been registered wherein the victim is the daughter of the applicant, therefore, on humanitarian ground the bail application be considered.

On the other hand Ld. Addl. PP for the State submits that the wife of the accused is not suffering from any major disease which would warrant grant of interim bail to the accused.

I have heard Ld. Addl. PP for the State and Ld. Counsel for the accused and perused the record.

Since, only interim bail was sought, therefore I restrain myself from discussing the merits of the case. The verification report has been filed wherein it is stated that the wife of the applicant had taken treatment from 3 departments of RML hospital i.e. Gynae, Surgery and Ortho. According to the Ortho Department the wife of the accused is suffering from left knee pain which is a general disease and is not critical. Similarly the Gynae and Surgery department has also opined that regular treatment

is required but the disease is not critical. Thus, in view of the verification report I do not find any ground to admit the accused on interim bail. Application for grant of interim bail of the accused stands dismissed. Copy of the charge-sheet be sent back.

Copy of this order be sent to the counsel for the accused through electronic mode.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

State Vs. Deepak
FIR No. : 320/20
P.S.: Kirti Nagar
U/s : 342/376/506 IPC

03.09.2020

Bail application is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 546/13785-13810/Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'ble District Judge (West).

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Ms. Sujata Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the accused.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Ld. Counsel for the accused wishes to withdraw the present bail application. Statement of the Ld. Counsel for the accused has been recorded in this regard.

In view of the statement of the Ld. Counsel for the accused, the present bail application is dismissed as withdrawn.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. Deepak
FIR No. : 320/20
P.S.: Kirti Nagar
U/s : 342/376/506 IPC

03.09.2020

Statement of Ms. Sujata Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the accused. Enroll. No. D-2093/2014

At Bar.

I am the counsel for the accused. I wish to withdraw the present bail application. The same be dismissed as withdrawn.

R.O. & A.C.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. Dr. N.K. Singh & Ors.
FIR No. : 516/20
P.S.: Hari Nagar
U/s : 4/5/6/23 PNDT Act

03.09.2020

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Ravinder Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant Gayatri Devi.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Reply filed by the IO. Copy supplied.

With the consent of counsel, arguments on the bail application heard. Put up for orders.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

O R D E R:-

On the complaint of the Nodal officer PC & PNDT Cell the present FIR was registered in which it was stated that on 22.08.2020 at about 5:00 pm. a telephone call was received by district Nodal Officer regarding decoy operation at Perfect Ultrasound Centre and Diagnostic Lab along with the team from Haryana. Dr. Harish Kumar Aryan Deputy Civil Surgeon Faridabad handed over the written information wherein it was brought to the notice of the complainant that sex of decoy customer has been disclosed. The statement of decoy customer namely Gauri Devi was recorded wherein she stated that ultrasound was run by Dr. Sonia Nath and the sex was disclosed by Mohit (employee of the above said centre).

Ld. Counsel for the accused has argued that decoy customer was not pregnant therefore, disclosing the sex does not arise. It is submitted that Dr. Sonia Narang, Sahib Kumar and Mohit have been granted bail. It is argued that the present applicant is only a student whose I-Card has been attached and has a 5 year old child to look after.

On the other hand Ld. Addl. PP for the state has submits that a sum of Rs. 12,000/- was recovered from the accused out of the total amount of Rs. 85,000/-. The investigation is at the initial stage and one of the co-accused is absconding.

I have heard Ld. Counsel for the accused and Ld. Addl. PP for the State and have perused the record.

As per the reply accused Deepu contacted the decoy customer where he called the decoy customer near Nangloi metro station and demanded a sum of Rs. 95,000/- for the test. The matter was settled for the sum of Rs. 85,000/- which was given to him by the decoy customer. He handed over the amount and the decoy customer to one Devender who handed over the decoy customer to the present applicant along with the sum of Rs. 22,000/-. The present applicant acted as a tout/middleman for helping the decoy customer to know the sex of the fetus. The allegations are serious in nature. Considering the facts of the case, I do not find any ground to admit the accused to bail. Application stands dismissed. Copy of the order be given dasti.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. 1. Deva and 2. Ritik
FIR No. : 0219/20
P.S.: Anand Parbat
U/s. : 323/307/34 IPC

03.09.2020

Bail application is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 546/13785-13810/Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'ble District Judge (West).

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Deepak Juneja, Ld. Counsel for the accused.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Reply on behalf of the IO has been filed. Copy has been supplied to the counsel for the accused.

With the consent of the counsel, arguments on the application heard.

Put up for order.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

ORDER:-

On the statement of Ghamshyam the present FIR was registered in which he alleged that on 15.08.2020 that he was present at his aunt's home where his cousin Prakash and his friend Arpit, Vishal, Raju and Azad were flying kites. It is further stated that cap of Arpit fell down on the roof of the house of Vicky who is the neighbour of Prakash. It is stated that they tried to lift the cap with the help of string (Maanza). The accused persons namely Vicky, Ritik and Deva were having liquor and on seeing the complainant they started abusing. Vicky extorted and said that

"niche aakar dikhao tumhe chaku marta hun". Prakash, Arpit and the complainant went downstairs where a quarrel took place with the other side. Complainant tried to save Prakash and Arpit upon which Vicky pushed him and stabbed Prakash with the help of knife and ran away.

Ld counsel for the accused has argued that in the FIR it is stated that cap of Arpit had fallen whereas in the reply it is stated that cap of Prakash has fallen. He submits that allegations made in the FIR are unbelievable. It is argued that the injured were discharged on the same day. Moreover, there are no allegations against the present applicant Deva and Ritik.

On the other hand Addl. PP for the State submits that all the three accused had in furtherance of common intention stabbed Prakash moreover, the final opinion in the MLC is still awaited.

I have heard Ld. Counsel for the accused and Ld. Addl PP for the State and have perused the record.

The final opinion in the MLC is still awaited. There is no dispute that Prakash was stabbed by Vicky and at that time both the applicants were present. It is also stated in the reply that Prakash and Arpit were also beaten by the accused persons and it is only when the complainant tried to save he was stabbed. The allegations against the accused persons are serious in nature and investigation is at its initial stage.

Considering the circumstances, bail application of the accused persons stands dismissed.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. ANKUR JAIN
ASJ-01, SPECIAL FAST TRACK COURT (WEST):TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI

Ajay Vs. State
FIR No. : 192/2020
PS : Anand Parbat
U/s : 379/356/411/34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

03.09.2020

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Mr. S. K. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

11:55 AM

1. The brief facts of the case are that DD no. 78A was received by HC Pappu Ram who along with Ct. Ajay went to the spot and met Ct. Nitesh and complainant. He recorded the statement of complainant who alleged that while he was going to his home after completing his work he met one person near Mother dairy who requested him to make a call from his mobile

phone. The complainant refused and started walking. The boy grabbed him and took out Rs. 590/- from his pocket. The complainant made hue and cry. Police officials who were on patrolling duty came and apprehended the boy. The money which was snatched was recovered.

2. Ld. Counsel for the accused argued that accused is in judicial custody for last about one month. There is no previous involvement as accused is no more required for investigation. The investigation qua the accused is completed.
3. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State submit that accused was apprehended at the spot. The allegations are serious in nature and therefore he does not deserve bail.
4. The accused was apprehended at the spot. There is no reason as to why the complainant would falsely implicate the accused. The allegations against the accused are serious in nature. At this stage, I do not find any ground to allow the bail application. Accordingly bail application is dismissed. Copy of order be sent to all concerned through electronic mode.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. ANKUR JAIN
ASJ-01, SPECIAL FAST TRACK COURT (WEST):TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI

Bail Application No. : 1925
Amit Katyal Vs. State
FIR No. : 105/820
PS : Kirti Nagar
U/s : 406/498A/506 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

03.09.2020

Fresh Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West / 2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Mr. Vineet Jindal, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Reply on behalf of IO filed. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused submits that he has received instructions from his client to withdraw the present bail application. He is directed to send an email.

Be awaited.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

03.09.2020 at 11:30 AM
Present: As above.

Email has been received. In view of the email anticipatory bail application is dismissed as withdrawn.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. ANKUR JAIN
ASJ-01, SPECIAL FAST TRACK COURT (WEST):TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI

State Vs. Meena
FIR No. : 92/2020
PS : Nihal Vihar
U/s : 380/411/34 IPC

Hearing took place through Cisco WebEx.

03.09.2020

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Mr. Pankaj Puneet, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

12: 05 PM

1. A complaint was given by Malvika Sawant to the effect that she is running a jewellery shop by the name of Balaji Jewellers. On 14.08.2020 at around 5 PM two ladies came and asked her to show gold ring. They also asked for ear rings. During this time two more ladies came. These ladies took some small item, however, later on when she checked her articles she found that ear rings and other articles have

been stolen. On these facts the above said FIR was registered.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused has argued that recovery has already been effected. Accused is not required for any investigation. There is no question of any influence being exerted by the accused on the witnesses.
3. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for State has submitted that allegations are serious in nature. The CCTV footage installed in the shop of the complainant clearly shows that four ladies have committed theft. Out of which one was applicant and stolen articles have been recovered.
4. I have heard Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused as well as Ld. Addl. PP for State and perused the record.
5. As per the report filed by IO on 14.08.2020 the accused had come to the same shop and asked the complainant to her articles. The complainant got suspicious as her voice resembled with the lady who had come on 04.02.2020. The complainant confronted the applicant, the applicant started running but was apprehended. On the next day complainant produced the CCTV footage and identified the applicant as the same person as the one who had committed theft on 04.02.2020. One pair of ear rings which was stolen on 04.02.2020 was also recovered. It is also stated in the reply that correct address has not been stated by the applicant and neither during interrogation she disclosed the address of her

real sister. The allegations against the accused are serious in nature. I do not find any ground to allow the bail application at this stage. Accordingly bail application is dismissed. Copy of order be sent to all concerned through electronic mode.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

State Vs. Ashok Kumar
FIR No. : 58/2019
P.S.: Mundka
U/s. :374/397/459/34 IPC & Section 25/27/54/59 Arms Act

03.09.2020

Bail application is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 546/13785-13810/Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'ble District Judge (West).

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
None for the accused.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Charge-sheet has not been received.

Let charge-sheet be summoned for ***14.09.2020.***

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF ANKUR JAIN
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE: SFTC (WEST)-01: DELHI

Sunil Vs. State.
FIR No. : 408/20
P.S.: Mundka
U/s. : 376/377/313/506 IPC

03.09.2020

Fresh Bail application has been filed. It be checked and registered and is taken up for hearing in terms of Circular No. 546/13785-13810/Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'ble District Judge (West).

Present: Sh. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Phool Kumar Singhania, Ld. Counsel for the accused.
Ms. Aarti Pandey Ld. Counsel from DCW.

Reply on behalf of the IO has been filed. Copy be supplied to the counsel for the accused.

Let notice of the application be issued to the complainant through IO in terms of the practice directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Put up for further proceedings on ***11.09.2020.***

(Ankur Jain)
ASJ (SFTC-01) West
Delhi: 03.09.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. ANKUR JAIN
ASJ-01, SPECIAL FAST TRACK COURT (WEST):TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI

Bail Application No. : 1807
Mohd. Sakib Vs. State
FIR No. : 690/20
PS : Nihal Vihar
U/s : 498A/304B/34 IPC

03.09.2020

Bail application taken up for hearing in terms of Circular no.546/13785-13810/ Bail Power/Gaz./DJ West/2020 dated 31.08.2020 of Hon'b'le District Judge (West).

Present: Mr. Subhash Chauhan, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Mr. Nagender Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused.

Reply has been field on behalf of Insp. Jigender Dagar. Copy supplied to Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused. Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused request for adjournment.

At request, adjourned for arguments on 11.09.2020.

(ANKUR JAIN)
ASJ(Special Fast Track Court)-01
West, THC, Delhi/03.09.2020