

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 55/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 302 IPC
State Vs. Jasim Ansari**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. Anil Kaushik, counsel for accused through video conferencing.

Part arguments heard.

Ld. APP for the state seeks some more time to go through the testimony of the material witnesses. Counsel for accused has no objection to the same.

Put up for further arguments on **08.07.2020**.

**(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020**

FIR No. 127/2020
PS : Rajouri Garden
U/s 21/61/85 NDPS Act
State Vs. Prince Kapoor

29.06.2020

Present: None.

Reply to bail application filed on behalf of IO.

The undersigned has contacted Ld. counsel for applicant on telephone & Ld. counsel requests for adjournment as he is not ready for arguments today.

At request of Ld. counsel, matter is adjourned for 02.07.2020.

(Reader)
29.06.2020

2/7/2020

for none

Despite several efforts no telephonic contact could be made with IO. Counsel hence, matter is adj of 4/7/2020

4/7/2020

for none

IO. Counsel of applicant is not connected despite best efforts
In interest of justice matter is adj
- 9/7/2020

2/7/2020

Ag/ 4/7/2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 78/2020
PS: Crime Branch
U/s 22/25 NDPS Act
State Vs. Chander Shekhar**


04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. Nitin Joshi, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Counsel for the accused is directed to provide the complete documents related to this case to the IO within 24 hours, who after verification of the said documents will file his proper report. Further, IO is directed to send his report on the e-mail ID (nitin.remedium@gmail.com) of counsel for applicant before the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **09.07.2020**.


**(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 78/2020
PS: Crime Branch
U/s 22/25 NDPS Act
State Vs. Pawan Arora**


04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. Nitin Joshi, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Counsel for the accused is directed to provide the complete documents related to this case to the IO within 24 hours, who after verification of the said documents will file his proper report. Further, IO is directed to send his report on the e-mail ID (nitin.remedium@gmail.com) of counsel for applicant before the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **09.07.2020**.


**(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020**

FIR No. 444/15
PS : Khyala
U/s 328/379/34 IPC
State Vs. Manoj @ Tufani

27.06.2020

Matter taken up through videoconferencing connected by Ahlmad of the court.

Present: Shri Parvesh Kumar Ranga, Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor.
Shri Gautam Kumar, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that applicant has already been convicted for an offence U/s 302 IPC and also jumped his parole. Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor requests that entire case summary of applicant be called from Jail Superintendent. Therefore, SHO as well as concerned Jail Superintendent are directed to file detailed case summary and report of past conduct, allegations and involvements of applicant in criminal offences, returnable for **04.07.2020**.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Spl. Judge (NDPS)
West District/THC/Delhi
27.06.2020

4/7/2020

for now
defendant's jail superintendent received
or required 10 copies telephone call
matter be put off - 9/7/2020

Issued

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ
4/7/2020

04.07.2020

Arguments heard by way of videoconferencing connected by the official of the court.

Present: Shri Parvesh Kumar Ranga, Learned Addl. PP for State.
Shri C.B Garg, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

By this order, I shall decide the application requesting for grant of interim bail for 45 days to applicant/accused Amit @ Sumit. Facts as stated in the bail application are as follows :

The present application has been filed under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in civil writ petition No. 3037/2020. It is submitted that bail is requested because of Covid-19 situation. Injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Investigation is complete. Applicant Amit @ Sumit is the only bread earner of the family having four children. Therefore, it is requested that applicant Amit @ Sumit may be released on interim bail for 45 days.

Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor has strongly opposed the present bail application in view of reply filed by the IO. The present bail application has been opposed on the following grounds :-

It is submitted that applicant Amit @ Sumit was arrested after three months of the incident because he was evading his arrest. It is submitted that co-accused Prakash has been declared a proclaimed offender from the court of Ld. MM and is yet to be arrested. It is submitted that applicant Amit @ Sumit does not have any permanent residential address. It is submitted that if applicant is granted

bail, he may commit more offences and may also threaten the prosecution witnesses and jump the bail. As per history, the applicant Amit @ Sumit is involved in two other offences in criminal nature.

I have heard arguments from both the sides.

In the present case, court is inclined to agree with the submissions of Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor. Applicant Amit @ Sumit appears to be a habitual offender. One co-accused Prakash has been declared a proclaimed offender and is yet to be arrested. Applicant does not have any permanent residential address. Applicant Amit @ Sumit may jump the bail and may influence & threaten the prosecution witnesses and may commit more offences. Therefore, in view of the above-mentioned discussions and observations, the applicant Amit @ Sumit is denied bail and the present bail application is rejected being any devoid of merit at this stage as no ground for grant of bail is made out.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, IO/SHO concerned, Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor and Jail Superintendent concerned on their e-mail IDs if provided and found to be correct, through proper channels.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Spl. Judge (NDPS)
West District/THC/Delhi
04.07.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

FIR No. 20/15
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 307/34 IPC
State Vs. Jai Narayan

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.
Mr. Nagendra Singh, counsel for the applicant/accused through video conferencing.

By this order, I shall decide the present application moved on behalf of accused/applicant Jai Narayan. It is stated that as per the direction of Hon'ble High Court dated 09.04.2020 in WP CrI. No. 779/20, accused was ordered to be released on personal bond. That the accused and his relatives could not furnish the local surety and therefore, he is in JC since more than three years. It is therefore, requested that the accused may be kindly be released on personal bond.

Arguments heard. Copy of order of Hon'ble High Court dated 09.04.2020, WP CrI. No. 779/2020 also filed. Same is perused.

Perusal of record reveals that vide order dated 14.01.2019, the accused/applicant was granted bail since then he could not produce a sound surety. Hence, no ground for allowing the present application is made out as the previous bail bond furnished before this court has already been rejected due to non-availability of sound surety. Moreover, bail was granted in the month of January but inability of accused to furnish surety casts doubt on his intentions to come back and face trial. Offence is of 307 IPC. Application is rejected.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned SHO and concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West, THC, Delhi/04.07.2020

01.07.2020

Arguments heard by the videoconferencing connected by official of the court.

Present: Shri Parvesh Kumar Ranga, Learned Addl. PP for State.
Shri Jitender Kumar Dhingra, counsel for applicant/accused Ramankant.

I have heard arguments from both the sides.

Counsel for the applicant Ramankant has filed this application requesting for extension of interim bail granted to him. Ld. counsel has submitted that he has applied for extension of interim bail for a period of 45 days based upon the recommendations and guidelines of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 20.06.2020. It is submitted that the applicant Ramankant was granted interim bail for a period of 30 days initially because of the present pandemic situation created by Corona virus and he has not misused the liberty of interim bail granted to him.

Investigating Officer of the case has opposed the extension. Moreover, Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor has also opposed the extension on the same grounds as that of the investigating officer.

After hearing arguments from both the sides, this court is inclined to extend the interim bail of the applicant Ramankant for a period of 45 days in view of the guidelines, recommendations and advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 20.06.2020. Therefore, interim bail of the applicant Ramankant stands extended by another 45 days upon the expiry of original period of 30 days. But the

applicant Ramankant shall remain bound by the same terms and conditions imposed upon him during the grant of initial period of 30 days during this extended period also. If the applicant Ramankant violates any of these conditions, the concerned Station House Officer can move an appropriate application to the Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor requesting for cancellation of this extended period of interim bail.

This application is disposed of accordingly.

One copy of this order be sent to Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor, IO, SHO, counsel for applicant Ramankant and Jail Superintendent concerned on their E-Mail IDs as provided and one copy be provided *dasti* if prayed for.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Spl. Judge (NDPS)
West District/THC/Delhi
01.07.2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 344/18
PS: Kirti Nagar
U/s 365/392/395/412/34 IPC
State Vs. Yogender Singh**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

By this order, I shall decide the present application requesting for interim bail for a period of 45 days on behalf of accused/applicant Yogender Singh. Facts as stated in the application are as follows:-

That the applicant is in JC since 12.09.2018. That bail is sought under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide minutes of meeting dated 18.05.2020. That applicant is seeking bail for a period of 45 days on grounds of family emergency. It is submitted that applicant has two minor children and his presence is necessary to ensure wellbeing of the family. It is submitted that daughter of applicant is not well and is in containment zone and suffering from viral fever and wife of applicant is not able to go outside. It is submitted that wife of applicant is patient of high blood pressure and diabetes and therefore, cannot look after the daughter. Previously also, applicant was released on interim bail and applicant did not misuse the liberty. It is submitted that Section 365/392/395 is not made out against the applicant and applicant has no role in the commission of alleged offence. It is submitted that applicant will not misuse, if bail is granted and is ready to follow any condition imposed by the court. It is therefore, prayed that the applicant Yogender Singh may be released on interim bail for a period of 60 days under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

FIR No. 344/18

-2-

PS: Kirti Nagar

U/s 365/392/395/412/34 IPC

State Vs. Yogender Singh

Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the bail application in view of reply of IO. Ld. APP has submitted that as per the verification report of wife of applicant, her condition is not serious. It is further submitted that applicant has five other cases of serious nature pending against him and is a habitual criminal and if he is released then, he is bound to commit more offences. The medical condition of wife of applicant is found to be well as per version of the treating doctor and wife of applicant has never visited the clinic after 11.06.2020.

I have heard arguments from both the sides. After hearing arguments, court is inclined to agree with the submissions of Ld. APP for the State. Applicant appears to be a habitual criminal having five other cases pending against him. There is a strong possibility that applicant may try and threaten and influence prosecution witnesses and may tamper with the case of prosecution. Commission of other offences by applicant is also highly likely in view of the history of the applicant. There is every possibility that applicant may jump bail and run away from the process of the court. Moreover, there does not appear to be any medical emergency or family emergency because of which applicant is required to be released on interim bail. Therefore, in view of abovementioned discussions and observations, the present application for grant of interim bail is rejected as no ground is made out for grant of interim bail at this stage.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned IO/SHO as well as concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 240/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 304-B/498A/34 IPC
State Vs. Ratan**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.
Mr. Anil Sharma, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

By this order, I shall decide the present application requesting for grant of bail to accused/applicant Ratan. Facts as stated in the application are as follows:-

It is submitted that the applicant is innocent and has not committed the alleged offence. It is submitted that there was no previous complaints or allegations of any dowry, harassment or cruelty against the deceased. It is submitted that applicant never made any demand for dowry and never harassed the wife. It is submitted that two other co-accused namely maternal uncle and the mother-in-law of the deceased have already been granted bail and the present bail is being sought on the grounds of parity, on the grounds of compassion and on the grounds of the present Covid-19 pandemic. It is submitted that there are no direct allegations against the applicant and there is only one statement against the applicant that he demanded dowry and harassed the wife.

Ld. APP for the state has opposed the bail application in view of reply filed by the IO. It is submitted that there are allegations against the applicant that he demanded dowry from the deceased and was also involved in physical violence.

FIR No. 240/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 304-B/498A/34 IPC
State Vs. Ratan

-2-

I have heard arguments from both the sides. Two other co-accused namely maternal uncle and mother-in-law have already been granted bail. Applicant is in JC for more than two years. Therefore, considering the period of incarceration and the advisory of Hon'ble High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and considering his good conduct received from the jail authorities and no other involvement in any other case, the applicant is granted bail subject to the following terms:-

1. That applicant shall furnish bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety to the satisfaction of the court.
2. That the applicant shall not contact the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
3. That the applicant shall appear on each and every date of hearing before the court and not seek any exemption.
4. That applicant shall not commit any other offence while being out on bail.

Under these conditions, applicant is granted bail. The prosecution or the SHO shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail application if the applicant violates any of the terms and conditions.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned IO/SHO as well as concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs or through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 344/18
PS: Kirti Nagar
U/s 365/392/395/412/34 IPC
State Vs. Ajay Yadav**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

By this order, I shall decide the present application requesting for interim bail for a period of 45 days on behalf of accused/applicant Ajay Yadav on the ground of illness of wife of applicant. The present application is also filed under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. It is submitted that there is no male member in the family of applicant to look after his wife and son. It is submitted that the applicant is a law abiding citizen and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that wife of applicant is suffering from high fever, vomiting and loose motion and is under treatment. It is further submitted that there is no other male member to look after wife and minor children. It is submitted that if applicant is granted interim bail, he shall not misuse the liberty and is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions. It is therefore requested that applicant may be released on interim bail for a period of 60 days.

Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the bail application in view of reply of Investigating Officer. Ld. APP has submitted that evidence against the applicant is very strong in the present case. It is further submitted that applicant is involved in 11 other criminal cases of serious nature and is a habitual criminal.

I have heard arguments from both the sides. After hearing arguments, this court is inclined to agree with the submissions of Ld. APP for the State. Applicant has

FIR No. 344/18

PS: Kirti Nagar

U/s 365/392/395/412/34 IPC

State Vs. Ajay Yadav & Ors.

-2-

11 other criminal cases of serious nature pending against him. Applicant appears to be a habitual criminal. There is a strong likelihood that applicant may tamper with the evidence and threaten and intimidate the prosecution witnesses. There is also a strong possibility that applicant may commit more offences, if he is released on bail. There is strong possibility that applicant may jump bail and try to pressurize the prosecution witnesses in the present case and other cases pending against him. Therefore, in view of above-mentioned discussions and observations and in view of verification of medical condition of wife of applicant since it was found that wife of applicant is not suffering from any major disease, the present application is rejected as no genuine ground is made out for grant of interim bail at this stage.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned IO/SHO as well as concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.

(SUNIL/BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 240/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 304-B/498-A/34 IPC
State Vs. Birender**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. Bhishm, counsel for applicant/accused from DLSA.

Accused has been produced through video conferencing from Tihar Jail. He is apprised that there are three separate bail applications received on his behalf and he has to clarify that which counsel will argue on his behalf.

Accused submits that Mr. Anil Sharma is authorised by him to argue his bail application. Hence, the application is withdrawn by DLSA counsel Mr. Bhishm vide his separate statement on the application itself.

In view of the same, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.

**(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 240/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 304-B/498-A/34 IPC
State Vs. Birender**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. Bhishm, counsel for applicant/accused from DLSA.

Accused has been produced through video conferencing from Tihar Jail. He is apprised that there are three separate bail applications received on his behalf and he has to clarify that which counsel will argue on his behalf.

Accused submits that Mr. Anil Sharma is authorised by him to argue his bail application. Hence, the application is withdrawn by DLSA counsel Mr. Bhishm vide his separate statement on the application itself.

In view of the same, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn.

**(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

FIR No. 137/17

PS: Khyala

U/s 302/397/201/411/452/34 IPC

State Vs. Pankaj Sharma

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.
Mr. Bhishm, counsel for applicant from DLSA through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

By this order, I shall decide the present application requesting for interim bail for a period of 45 days on behalf of accused/applicant Pankaj Sharma. Facts as stated in the application are as follows:-

That the present bail application is filed in compliance of the order passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 10.06.2020. That the applicant is in JC since 08.05.2017. That the applicant has been falsely implicated by the police officials. It is therefore requested that accused/applicant may be released on interim bail under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Ld. APP for the State has strongly opposed the bail application in view of reply of IO. Ld. APP has submitted that the accused/applicant has sought bail on the ground of taking care of his family members which is not genuine and general in nature. It is further submitted that applicant is involved in two criminal cases.

I have heard arguments from both the sides. After hearing arguments, court is inclined to agree with the submissions of Ld. APP for the State. The ground taken by the applicant for interim bail does not seem to be genuine. Also, the accused is involved in two criminal cases and the conduct certificate issued by Jail Superintendent

FIR No. 137/17

-2-


PS: Khyala

U/s 302/397/201/411/452/34 IPC

State Vs. Pankaj Sharma

is 'not satisfactory'. There does not appear to be any emergency because of which applicant is required to be released on interim bail. Therefore, in view of above-mentioned discussions and observations, the present application for grant of interim bail is rejected as no ground is made out for grant of interim bail at this stage.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned IO/SHO as well as concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.


(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 240/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 304-B/498A/34 IPC
State Vs. Birender**

04.07.2020


Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.
Mr. Anil Sharma, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

By this order, I shall decide the present application requesting for grant of bail to accused/applicant Birender. Facts as stated in the application are as follows:-

It is submitted that the applicant is innocent and has not committed the alleged offence. It is submitted that there was no previous complaints or allegations of any dowry, harassment or cruelty against the deceased. It is submitted that applicant never made any demand for dowry and never harassed the daughter-in-law. It is submitted that two other co-accused namely maternal uncle and the mother-in-law of the deceased have already been granted bail and the present bail is being sought on the grounds of parity, on the grounds of compassion and on the grounds of the present Covid-19 pandemic. It is submitted that there are no direct allegations against the applicant and there is only one statement against the applicant that he demanded dowry and harassed the daughter-in-law.

Ld. APP for the state has opposed the bail application in view of reply filed by the IO. It is submitted that there are allegations against the applicant that he demanded dowry from the deceased and was also involved in physical violence.



FIR No. 240/16
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s 304-B/498A/34 IPC
State Vs. Birender

-2-

I have heard arguments from both the sides. Two other co-accused namely maternal uncle and mother-in-law have already been granted bail. Applicant is in JC since March 2016. therefore, considering the period of incarceration and the advisory of Hon'ble High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and considering his good conduct received from the jail authorities and no other involvement in any other case, the applicant is granted bail subject to the following terms:-

1. That applicant shall furnish bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety to the satisfaction of the court.
2. That the applicant shall not contact the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
3. That the applicant shall appear on each and every date of hearing before the court and not seek any exemption.
4. That applicant shall not commit any other offence while being out on bail.

Under these conditions, applicant is granted bail. The prosecution or the SHO shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail application if the applicant violates any of the terms and conditions.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned IO/SHO as well as concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs or through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 284/15
PS: Anand Parbat
U/s 302/34 IPC
State Vs. Satish**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. Ravinder Kumar, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

This is an application requesting for grant of interim bail. It is submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated by the police. It is submitted that applicant is seeking interim bail for a period of 45 days under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and its Hon'ble High Powered Committee.

Ld. APP for state has strongly opposed this bail application in view of reply filed by the IO. It is submitted that applicant is accused of offence under Section 302 IPC. It is submitted that out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, 21 have already been examined and they all have supported the case of prosecution. It is submitted that case against the applicant is very strong and if granted bail, there is every possibility that applicant will jump bail and run away from the process of the court to impede the trial.

I have heard arguments from both the sides. This court is inclined to agree with the submissions of Ld. APP for the state in this case. Charges against the applicant are very grave and serious in nature. As per reply of IO, prosecution witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution. Therefore, there is every

FIR No. 284/15
PS: Anand Parbat
U/s 302/34 IPC
State Vs. Satish

-2-

possibility that applicant might run away and jump bail. Moreover, no genuine ground is made out for grant of interim bail to applicant in view of emergency. In view of the above-mentioned discussions, present application is rejected.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned SHO and concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

04.07.2020

Arguments heard by way of videoconferencing connected by the official of the court.

Present: Shri Parvesh Kumar Ranga, Learned Addl. PP for State.
Shri C.B Garg, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

By this order, I shall decide the application requesting for grant of interim bail for 45 days to applicant/accused Sunil @ Jangli. Facts as stated in the bail application are as follows :

The present application has been filed under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in civil writ petition No. 3037/2020. It is submitted that bail is requested because of Covid-19 situation. Injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Investigation is complete. Applicant Sunil is the only bread earner of the family having four children. Therefore, it is requested that applicant Sunil may be released on interim bail for 45 days.

Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor has strongly opposed the present bail application in view of reply filed by the IO. It is submitted that there are in total four accused persons in the present case. Accused is under trial for offences U/s 307/452/326/323/34 IPC. It is submitted that one co-accused Prakash is yet to be arrested and the incident is dated 13.09.2016. Co-accused Prakash has been declared a proclaimed offender from the court of Ld. MM. It is submitted that present applicant Sunil is not having permanent address and resides in *jhuggi-jhopri* cluster. Bail is opposed on the ground that applicant may commit more offences and may

intimidate & threaten the public witnesses of the present case and may jump the bail.
As per previous conviction & involvement report, applicant Sunil is involved in a total six criminal cases.

I have heard arguments from both the sides.

Applicant Sunil appears to be a habitual criminal being involved in six criminal cases, all serious in nature. Moreover, one co-accused has been declared a proclaimed offender and has not been arrested till date. If applicant Sunil is granted bail, there is every possibility that applicant may jump the bail and run away from the process of the court and may commit other offences and may influence & threaten the prosecution witnesses. Therefore, in view of the above-mentioned discussions and observations, the applicant Sunil is denied bail and the present bail application is rejected being devoid of any merit at this stage as no ground for grant of bail is made out.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, IO/SHO concerned, Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor and Jail Superintendent concerned on their e-mail IDs if provided and found to be correct, through proper channels.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Spl. Judge (NDPS)
West District/THC/Delhi
04.07.2020

4/1/2020

For name

↳ Contract has been found

↳ Contract but due

↳ technical issue

matter in city for signature

Agg
signature

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 284/15
PS: Anand Parbat
U/s 302/34 IPC
State Vs. Satish**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.
Mr. Ravinder Kumar, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

This is an application requesting for grant of interim bail. It is submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated by the police. It is submitted that applicant is seeking interim bail for a period of 45 days under the advisory of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and its Hon'ble High Powered Committee.

Ld. APP for state has strongly opposed this bail application in view of reply filed by the IO. It is submitted that applicant is accused of offence under Section 302 IPC. It is submitted that out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, 21 have already been examined and they all have supported the case of prosecution. It is submitted that case against the applicant is very strong and if granted bail, there is every possibility that applicant will jump bail and run away from the process of the court to impede the trial.

I have heard arguments from both the sides. This court is inclined to agree with the submissions of Ld. APP for the state in this case. Charges against the applicant are very grave and serious in nature. As per reply of IO, prosecution witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution. Therefore, there is every

FIR No. 284/15
PS: Anand Parbat
U/s 302/34 IPC
State Vs. Satish

-2-

possibility that applicant might run away and jump bail. Moreover, no genuine ground is made out for grant of interim bail to applicant in view of emergency. In view of the above-mentioned discussions, present application is rejected.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned SHO and concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

FIR No. 187/18
PS: Crime Branch
U/s 20/25/29 NDPS Act
State Vs. Vinod Rathore

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. R.K Giri counsel for applicant/accused through video conferencing

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

By this order, I shall decide the present bail application moved on behalf of accused/applicant Vinod Rathore for grant of interim bail. Facts as stated in the application are as follows:-

It is submitted that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated. It is submitted that the present application has been filed on the ground of extreme medical emergency (medical documents annexed). It is submitted that the applicant is a patient of kidney stone and other related ailments because of which his health has gone considerably. It is requested that applicant does not have access to have proper medical facilities inside the jail in view of his peculiar medical emergency. It is submitted that applicant requires to be treated properly in a private hospital where he can be properly looked after.

Ld. APP for state has opposed this bail application on the grounds of merit but has submitted that in view of the medical status report received from the jail authorities and the concerned medical officer incharge, applicant may be released on interim bail to take care of his medical emergency. Therefore, in view of

FIR No. 187/18
PS: Crime Branch
U/s 20/25/29 NDPS Act
State Vs. Vinod Rathore

the detailed reply filed by the medical officer incharge, central jail regarding the acute medical emergency of the applicant, he is granted interim bail for a period of 45 days to get his ailment treated and submit proper medical document of his treatment at the time of his surrender before concerned jail authorities subject to the following further conditions:-

- 1 *that the applicant shall surrender in the forenoon session before the jail authorities alongwith his medical documents of treatment.*
- 2 *that the applicant shall furnish a bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of like amount.*
- 3 *that the applicant shall not jump bail and attend the court on each and every date of hearing.*
- 4 *that the applicant shall not interfere with the case of prosecution in any manner.*
- 5 *that the applicant shall not indulge in any other offence.*

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned SHO and concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

04.07.2020

Arguments heard by way of videoconferencing connected by the official of the court.

Present: Shri Parvesh Kumar Ranga, Learned Addl. PP for State.
Shri Ravinder Samuel, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

By this order, I shall decide the bail application filed on behalf of applicant Jeoffery Boateng. Facts as stated in the bail application are as follows :

This case is under NDPS Act, U/s 21 & 25 NDPS Act and U/s 14 of The Foreigners Act, 1946. It is submitted that as per the case of the prosecution, nothing was recovered from the house or at the instance of the applicant Jeoffery Boateng. It is submitted that applicant Jeoffery Boateng is innocent and has been falsely implicated. It is submitted that applicant Jeoffery Boateng has clean antecedents and is not a previous convict. It is submitted that applicant Jeoffery Boateng has spent more than one year in judicial custody. It is submitted that there is no apprehension that the applicant Jeoffery Boateng will abscond or tamper with the prosecution evidence if he is released on bail. It is, therefore, requested that the applicant Jeoffery Boateng be released on bail till the disposal of the case as the actual quantity recovered from the applicant Jeoffery Boateng is a small quantity.

Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application in view of reply filed by the IO.

It is submitted that as per examination report of Forensic Science Laboratory : Rohini, applicant Jeoffery Boateng was found to be in possession of commercial quantity of contraband as per page 12 of the application filed. It is submitted

that applicant Jeoffery Boateng is not a citizen of India and has no valid passport or visa. It is submitted that applicant Jeoffery Boateng was staying illegally in the country and conducted illegal trade of Narcotics thereby damaging the country. It is further submitted that the examination result of FSL, Rohini, Delhi, is found positive and even the High Commission of Ghana could not verify the details of passport & visa and was not able to identify him which shows that applicant Jeoffery Boateng has entered India fraudulently. It is submitted that applicant was found in possession of commercial quantity of contraband and is not having any permanent address in Delhi or India. It is submitted that there is every possibility that applicant Jeoffery Boateng will jump the bail and may indulge in crime of similar nature in order to earn money.

I have heard arguments from both the sides.

In this case, the court is inclined to agree with the submissions of Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor. As per latest judgment delivered by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Hira Singh**, the applicant was found in possession of commercial quantity of contraband even though mixed with other stuff. After testing of the contraband, the result came out as positive. Even his own country of origin i.e. Ghana could not verify the details and identity of passport & visa of the applicant Jeoffery Boateng. Applicant Jeoffery Boateng is not having any permanent address in Delhi or India and there is every possibility that applicant Jeoffery Boateng may jump the bail and run away from the process of court in order to evade the trial. Therefore, in view of the above-mentioned discussions and observations, the present bail application is rejected at this stage as no ground for grant of bail is made out.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, IO/SHO concerned, Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor and Jail Superintendent concerned on their e-mail IDs if provided and found to be correct, through proper channels.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Spl. Judge (NDPS)
West District/THC/Delhi
04.07.2020

FIR No. 444/2016
PS : Ranhola
U/s 341/308/506/34 IPC
State Vs. Ravi @ Kalu

04.07.2020

Arguments heard by way of videoconferencing connected by the official of the court.

Present: Shri Parvesh Kumar Ranga, Learned Addl. PP for State.
Shri Pramod K Tiwary, Ld. counsel for applicant/accused.

By this order, I shall decide the present application filed on behalf of applicant/accused Ravi @ Kalu requesting for grant of interim bail for 45 days. Facts as stated in the bail application are as follows :

That the applicant Ravi @ Kalu is in judicial custody since September 2016. That the applicant has been falsely implicated. That applicant Ravi @ Kalu is suffering from stone in his stomach and requires treatment. That the applicant Ravi @ Kalu falls under the criteria laid down by Hon'ble High Powered Committee of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. That parents of applicant Ravi @ Kalu are not supportive. That applicant Ravi @ Kalu has a minor daughter. That applicant Ravi @ Kalu has no other relative to look after his family. It is, therefore, prayed that applicant Ravi @ Kalu be released on interim bail for a period of 45 days.

His report has been received from the Jail Superintendent concerned.

Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail application in view of report filed by the Jail Superintendent as well as the reply filed by the IO. It is submitted that the applicant Ravi @ Kalu did not report medical complaints. It is submitted that he complained of pain in abdomen for which he has been advised for appropriate medications and investigations and for surgery & medicine review.

Complaints of intermittent pain abdomen are persisting and the general medical condition of the applicant Ravi @ Kalu is stable on medications. All prescribed medicines are provided and investigations are being done. IO of the case has strongly opposed the bail application on the ground that there are direct allegations against the applicant by the complainant for offence U/s 308/341/506/34 IPC. It is submitted that applicant Ravi @ Kalu alongwith co-accused inflicted knife injuries upon the person of complainant and if bail is granted, applicant Ravi @ Kalu may threaten the witnesses and also may jump bail.

I have heard arguments from both the sides.

Applicant Ravi @ Kalu is facing trial U/s 308 IPC. Allegations against the applicant and other co-accused are direct & grave in nature. Complainant was assaulted with knife injuries. Moreover, medical condition of applicant Ravi @ Kalu is stated to be stable and he has been given all the necessary medicines and is kept in close observation in the jail dispensary. Moreover, if bail is granted, there is strong possibility that applicant Ravi @ Kalu may try & threaten the prosecution witnesses and may also jump the bail. Therefore, in view of the above-mentioned discussions and observations, the present bail application is rejected at this stage as no ground for grant of bail is made out.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, IO/SHO concerned, Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor and Jail Superintendent concerned on their e-mail IDs if provided and found to be correct, through proper channels.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Spl. Judge (NDPS)
West District/THC/Delhi
04.07.2020

**IN THE COURT OF SH. SUNIL BENIWAL
ASJ/SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI**

**FIR No. 251/19
PS: Rajouri Garden
U/s 21 NDPS Act and 14 Foreigners Act
State Vs. Dorcus Nansamba**

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. J.S Kushwaha, counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Arguments on bail application heard through video conferencing connected by court official.

This is an application requesting for grant of interim bail under Section 21 NDPS Act and Section 14 Foreigners Act. It is submitted that recovery of 50 grams of heroine has been planted upon the applicant and that she is innocent. It is also submitted that as the applicant is having a child, she may be granted interim bail for a period of 45 days.

Ld. APP for state has strongly opposed this bail application in view of reply filed by the IO. It is submitted that 50 grams heroine was recovered from the possession of applicant which is intermediate quantity. It is submitted that main ground of opposition of bail application is that applicant is foreigner, not having any valid visa for staying in India or not having any permanent address to live in Delhi or India. It is also submitted that if the applicant is granted bail, she will indulge in the same offence and also run away and jump bail.

I have heard arguments from both the sides. Even report has been received from the jail authorities with respect to her child. The child of the applicant

FIR No. 251/19

-2-

PS: Rajouri Garden

U/s 21 NDPS Act and 14 Foreigners Act

State Vs. Dorcus Nansamba

is stated to have good health and is not suffering from any ailment. Therefore, keeping in view the fact that the applicant is foreigner, not having any valid visa and also not having any permanent address in Delhi or India, the present application is rejected as there is strong possibility that she may jump bail and run away from the process of the court.

Copy of this order be sent to counsel for applicant, to the concerned SHO and concerned Jail Superintendent on their e-mail IDs and through proper channel.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 443/16
PS: Patel Nagar
State Vs. Akshay

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. R.R Jha counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

On request of counsel for applicant, matter is adjourned for final arguments to **06.07.2020**.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 837/99
PS: Paschim Vihar
State Vs. Madan

04.07.2020

Present: Mr. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State through video conferencing.

Mr. R.K Giri counsel for applicant through video conferencing.

Part arguments heard through video conferencing.

Put up for further arguments on **08.07.2020**.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 288/2013
P.S. Paschim Vihar West
State Vs. Shiv Lal etc.

04.07.2020

File taken up today in compliance of order no. 16/DHC/2020 dated 13.06.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as the case was fixed for 07.04.2020 and could not be taken up on 07.04.2020 due to lockdown in context of Covid-19.

Present : None for the State.
None for accused.

Case is adjourned *en bloc* in compliance of above said order, for 19.09.2020 for the purpose already fixed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 240/2016
P.S. Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Ratan Singh etc.

04.07.2020

File taken up today in compliance of order no. 16/DHC/2020 dated 13.06.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as the case was fixed for 07.04.2020 and could not be taken up on 07.04.2020 due to lockdown in context of Covid-19.

Present : None for the State.
None for accused.

Case is adjourned *en bloc* in compliance of above said order, for 19.09.2020 for the purpose already fixed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 723/2016
P.S. Nihal Vihar
State Vs. Nilesh

04.07.2020

File taken up today in compliance of order no. 16/DHC/2020 dated 13.06.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as the case was fixed for 07.04.2020 and could not be taken up on 07.04.2020 due to lockdown in context of Covid-19.

Present : None for the State.
None for accused.

Case is adjourned *en bloc* in compliance of above said order, for 19.09.2020 for the purpose already fixed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 1/2018
P.S. Crime Branch
State Vs. Austin

04.07.2020

File taken up today in compliance of order no. 16/DHC/2020 dated 13.06.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as the case was fixed for 25.03.2020 and 07.04.2020 and could not be taken up on 25.03.2020 and 07.04.2020 due to lockdown in context of Covid-19.

Present : None for the State.
None for accused.

Case is adjourned *en bloc* in compliance of above said order, for **19.09.2020** for the purpose already fixed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 570/2013
P.S. Rajouri Garden
State Vs. Mohd. Anish

04.07.2020

File taken up today in compliance of order no. 16/DHC/2020 dated 13.06.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as the case was fixed for 07.04.2020 and could not be taken up on 07.04.2020 due to lockdown in context of Covid-19.

Present : None for the State.
 None for accused.

Case is adjourned *en bloc* in compliance of above said order, for 19.09.2020 for the purpose already fixed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 610/2018
P.S. Ranhola
State Vs. Rajneesh Kumar etc

04.07.2020

File taken up today in compliance of order no. 16/DHC/2020 dated 13.06.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as the case was fixed for 07.04.2020 and could not be taken up on 07.04.2020 due to lockdown in context of Covid-19.

Present : None for the State.
None for accused.

Case is adjourned *en bloc* in compliance of above said order, for **19.09.2020** for the purpose already fixed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020

FIR No. 23/2011
P.S. Rajouri Garden
State Vs. Sandeep Gaba etc.

04.07.2020

File taken up today in compliance of order no. 16/DHC/2020 dated 13.06.2020 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as the case was fixed for 07.04.2020 and could not be taken up on 07.04.2020 due to lockdown in context of Covid-19.

Present : None for the State.
 None for accused.

Case is adjourned *en bloc* in compliance of above said order, for **19.09.2020** for the purpose already fixed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL)
ASJ/Special Judge (NDPS)
West District, THC
Delhi/04.07.2020