

Bail Application no: 2060/20
State Vs. Himanshu Mavi @ Aman
FIR No: 156/20
Under Section:394/411/34 IPC
PS: Timarpur

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

This is an application under Section 438 Cr.P.C for anticipatory bail moved on behalf of applicant/accused.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.
Sh. Ujjwal Puri, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant

Reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO). Copy of same is supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is argued that accused/applicant is named in the FIR only after the disclosure statement of co-accused. It is further argued that accused was not present at the spot and was rather at Bulandshar and even complainant is supporting the said version of applicant/accused. It is further argued that the said fact can be verified by this court from the complainant.

Per contra Ld. APP for State has opposed the instant application on the ground that allegations against the accused are grave and serious. It is further argued that custodial interrogation of the accused is required for recovery of the part of case property and for effective investigation in the instant case.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The case of prosecution in nutshell is that on 04.07.2020 at about 03:30 PM, accused/applicant alongwith other co-accused Vishal @ Kalu, accused Rahul , accused Dilip @ Sonu robbed complainant of an amount of Rs. 10,000/- after beating and pressing

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:43:21 +0530

contd..2/-

Bail Application no: 2060/20
State Vs. Himanshu Mavi @ Aman
FIR No: 156/20
Under Section:394/411/34 IPC
PS: Timarpur

his neck. Two of the co-accused namely Vishal @ Kalu and Rahul were arrested from the spot whereas applicant/accused and other co-accused had fled away from the spot alongwith part of robbed cash.

Hon'ble High of Delhi in the case of **Homi Rajvansh Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation, 185 (2011) DLT 774** has held as follows:

"There is a perceptible difference in the results of the interrogation when a person who has an order of anticipatory bail in his pocket and goes to the investigation agency. He is bound not to cooperate and not to give the correct answer to the questions put to him to reach at the bottom of the case as against the person who is in custody or who does not have the protection of the anticipatory bail."

In **State (CBI) Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 CrL LJ 4414**, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:

"Success in such interrogation would allude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual."

The allegations against accused are grave and serious. The name of accused was disclosed at the spot itself by co-accused and also emerges in FIR. It appears that accused is attempting to interfere with the course of investigation by contacting the victim and influencing him. The plea of 'alibi' can only be tested during course of investigation/trial and not at this stage. Custodial interrogation of accused would be required for recovery of remaining case property.

Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of the offence, role of accused and since custodial interrogation of accused would be

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17 14:43:27
+0530

contd..3/-

Bail Application no: 2060/20
State Vs. Himanshu Mavi @ Aman
FIR No: 156/20
Under Section:394/411/34 IPC
PS: Timarpur

required for recovery of remaining case property, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to applicant. **Accordingly, the instant application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed.**

Copy of the order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/IO/SHO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

I may clarify that nothing expressed herein shall tantamount to an expression on the merit of present case.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:43:34 +0530
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Bail Application no: 2061/20

State Vs. Deepak

FIR No: 261/20

Under Section: 307/34 IPC

PS: Burari

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

This is an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of bail moved on behalf of accused/applicant.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State
Sh.Digvijay Singh, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant

Reply filed by Investigating Officer (IO). Copy of same has been supplied to defence. This is second bail application filed on behalf of applicant/accused. First bail application was dismissed by Ld. ASJ (on duty) vide order dated 13.07.2020.

Ld. Defence counsel has vehemently argued for grant of bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with alleged crime. It is argued that a simple case of quarrel in neighbourhood has been converted into a case under Section 307 IPC. It is further argued that mother of applicant/accused is bed ridden since long and presence of accused is required to take care of her. It is further argued that considering the period of custody, discharge of victim from hospital and clean antecedents of applicant/accused, he may be granted bail in the instant case.

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has argued for dismissal of bail on the ground that earlier application of accused (for grant of bail) was dismissed by Ld. ASJ and there is no change of circumstance since passing of said order.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The earlier bail application of accused was dismissed by Ld. ASJ vide

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:42:01 +0530

contd..2/-

Bail Application no: 2061/20

State Vs. Deepak

FIR No: 261/20

Under Section: 307/34 IPC

PS: Burari

detailed order dated 13.07.2020 while considering all the contentions which have been raised in present application. Perusal of order dated 13.07.2020 reveals that Ld. ASJ while noting down facts in details has observed as follow:

"Allegations against accused/applicant are of serious nature. Applicant/accused caught hold of injured/victim and co-accused stabbed her. Injured/victim is still admitted in hospital and her statement is yet to be recorded. The investigation of the case is at very initial stage and chances of fleeing away from the process of law as well as tampering with evidence/witnesses cannot be ruled out at this stage".

Therefore, it is evident that the earlier application moved on behalf of accused/applicant was dismissed by Ld. ASJ keeping in view of seriousness of the offence and the role played by accused. All the contentions (as raised in the instant application) have already been dealt with previously. Mere discharge of victim from hospital since passing of said order cannot be termed as any change of circumstance.

In the case of **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav and Another, (2005) 2 SCC 42**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:

"Ordinarily, the issues which had been canvassed earlier would not be permitted to be re-agitated on the same grounds, as the same it would lead to a speculation and uncertainty in the administration of justice and may lead to forum hunting."

In the case of **State of Tamil Nadu vs S.A. Raja Appeal (crl.) 1470 of 2005** decided on 26 October, 2005, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:42:10 +0530

contd..3/-

Bail Application no: 2061/20

State Vs. Deepak

FIR No: 261/20

Under Section: 307/34 IPC

PS: Burari

"Of course, the principles of res judicata are not applicable to bail applications, but the repeated filing of the bail applications without there being any change of circumstances would lead to bad precedents."

In the case of **Harish Kathuria & Anr. Vs. State, Bail Application No. 1135/2011, decided on 18.08.2011, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi** has observed as follows :

"Successive bail applications can be filed as has been held in the catena of judgments but then it has been observed that there must be change in circumstances which warrant fresh consideration of the application. Successive bail applications without there being any change in circumstances is not only to be deprecated but is in effect a gross abuse of the processes of law which must be visited with some amount of sanction by way of cost for wasting the time of the Court. There are cases of persons who are languishing in jail for wanting their appeals to be heard for want of time while as unscrupulous persons like the petitioners, who have embarked on a forum shopping or rather be called a bench hopping, are wasting the time of the Court."

There is no change of circumstance since passing of said order. The other reason cited by accused for grant of bail (illness of his mother) does not disclose good grounds to be entertained as very incarceration of an accused not only curtails his 'personal liberty' but also certain other rights like 'right to maintain and take care of one's family'.

As there is no change in circumstances since dismissal of previous application for bail and, therefore, the instant application is also to meet the same fate.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:42:18 +0530

Contd..4/-

Bail Application no: 2061/20

State Vs. Deepak

FIR No: 261/20

Under Section: 307/34 IPC

PS: Burari

In view of the aforesaid discussion, **application for grant of bail moved on behalf of the applicant stands dismissed.**

Copy of this order be sent to Ld. Magistrate/Ld. Defence Counsel/SHO/IO and concerned jail superintendent through e-mail.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:42:25
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Bail Application no: 2050/20

State Vs. Arvind Kumar & ors

FIR No: 258/20

Under Section: 323/341/452/506/34 IPC

PS: Subzi Mandi

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

This is a joint application under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of applicants/accused.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.
Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicants/accused

Reply filed by IO. Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

The brief case of prosecution is that on 04.08.2020 at about 10:30 PM, accused/applicants namely Arvind Kumar, Pankaj, Yuvraj, Monu and Sonu along with some unknown persons trespassed into the office of complainant being armed with danda and baseball bats and assaulted the complainant and other victim namely Puneet Sharma. The reason for said assault is stated to be business rivalry as parties are in same business of travel agency and applicants wanted to get the office of complainant/victim closed. The allegations of wrongful restraint and threatening are also there.

Ld. Defence counsel is seeking bail on the ground that accused/applicants have been falsely implicated in the present case and they have nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is argued that to complainant has filed false and frivolous complaint against the accused/applicants. It is further argued that applicants/accused have clean antecedents and therefore, they deserve to be granted bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case. It is further argued that there is a delay of more than seven (07) days in registration of present FIR and it is rather complainant/victims, who want to drive applicants, out of their business.

Per contra Ld. APP for State has opposed the instant application on the ground that allegations against the accused /applicants are grave and serious. It is

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:41:25 +0530

contd..2/-

Bail Application no: 2050/20

State Vs. Arvind Kumar & ors

FIR No: 258/20

Under Section: 323/341/452/506/34 IPC

PS: Subzi Mandi

argued that accused/applicants have been evading their arrest and have not joined the investigation in the present case. It is further argued that custodial interrogation of the accused/applicants is required for recovery of weapon of offence. It is further argued that TIP of accused/applicants is to be conducted and recovery of motorcycle and Auto rickshaw (wherein the accused fled from spot after commission of offences) is yet to be made. It is argued that matter is at initial stage and therefore, present application may be dismissed in the facts and circumstances of instant case.

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

Hon'ble High of Delhi in the case of **Homi Rajvansh Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation, 185 (2011) DLT 774** has held as follows:

"There is a perceptible difference in the results of the interrogation when a person who has an order of anticipatory bail in his pocket and goes to the investigation agency. He is bound not to cooperate and not to give the correct answer to the questions put to him to reach at the bottom of the case as against the person who is in custody or who does not have the protection of the anticipatory bail."

In **State (CBI) Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 CrL LJ 4414**, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:

"Success in such interrogation would allude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual."

Considering the gravity of the offence and since custodial interrogation of accused would be required for recovery of weapon of offence/vehicle (wherein accused fled away) and for effective investigation, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:41:35
+0530

contd..3/-

Bail Application no: 2050/20

State Vs. Arvind Kumar & ors

FIR No: 258/20

Under Section: 323/341/452/506/34 IPC

PS: Subzi Mandi

applicant. The contention of defence regarding false implication or delay in registration of FIR can only be tested during course of investigation/trial and not at this stage. The injuries suffered by victims do not prima facie appear to be self inflicted. Therefore, **the instant application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed.**

Copy of the order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/IO/SHO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

I may clarify that nothing expressed herein shall tantamount to an expression on the merit of present case.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:41:42
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Bail Application no.2042/20

State Vs. Puran

FIR No: 255/20

Under Section:323/341/308/34 IPC

PS: Burari

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

**This is an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C for interim bail filed on
on behalf of applicant/accused.**

**Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State
None for applicant**

Reader of this court has informed that Ld. Counsel has sought adjournment on the ground that he has to rush to hospital. Ld. APP for the State has not opposed the prayer of defence.

In these circumstances, matter stands adjourned for **27.08.2020.**

Longer date has been given as Reader informs that defence counsel has requested for keeping the matter for next week.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:40:45 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

Bail Application no: 1975/20

State Vs. Deepak @ Deepu

FIR No: 91/20

Under Section: 302/34 IPC

PS: Gulabi Bagh

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

This is an application under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of applicant/accused.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State
Sh. Jitender Sethi, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant

Reply by IO filed. Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

Ld. Counsel for accused has argued for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is argued that applicant/accused was not present at the spot and was rather in his house. It is further argued that he has already annexed affidavits of two of his neighbours namely Mahesh Kumar and Raj bala in support of said assertions.. It is further argued that the records regarding his mobile location would also show his presence at his house and not at the spot of incident and the said fact can very well be verified by IO. It is argued that applicant has deep roots in society and therefore, deserves to be granted bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Per contra, Ld. APP for State has opposed the instant application on the ground that allegations against accused are grave and serious. It is argued that accused has been evading his arrest and has not joined the investigation in the present case. It is further argued that custodial interrogation of accused/applicant is required for effective investigation in the instant case. It is argued that the investigation is the sole prerogative of IO and defence cannot direct the manner of conduct of same. On these grounds, Ld. APP has requested for dismissal of instant application.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:40:02 +0530

Contd..2/-

Bail Application no: 1975/20

State Vs. Deepak @ Deepu

FIR No: 91/20

Under Section: 302/34 IPC

PS: Gulabi Bagh

I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

The case of prosecution in nutshell is that on 26.05.2020 at about 10:00 PM, accused Depak @ Deepu, Gaurav, Ankush, Ritik and Manish came to house of Vishal (complainant) and his brother Abhishek(victim). It is stated that co-accused Ankush, Ritik and Manish caught hold of victim and co-accused Gaurav stabbed him with a knife. The applicant/accused is alleged to have exhorted that the victim should be finished. On the statement of complainant, FIR was registered. During treatment, victim Abhishek got expired.

Hon'ble High of Delhi in the case of **Homi Rajvansh Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation, 185 (2011) DLT 774** has held as follows:

"There is a perceptible difference in the results of the interrogation when a person who has an order of anticipatory bail in his pocket and goes to the investigation agency. He is bound not to cooperate and not to give the correct answer to the questions put to him to reach at the bottom of the case as against the person who is in custody or who does not have the protection of the anticipatory bail."

In **State (CBI) Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 Cri. LJ 4414**, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:

"Success in such interrogation would allude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual."

The allegations against accused are grave and serious and he has been specifically named in the FIR by eye-witness. Accused has been evading his arrest and NBW have already been issued by the concerned court against him. He is reported to

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:40:11 +0530

Contd..3/-

Bail Application no: 1975/20

State Vs. Deepak @ Deepu

FIR No: 91/20

Under Section: 302/34 IPC

PS: Gulabi Bagh

be a 'Bad Character' of his area, therefore, the possibility of accused tampering with evidence or threatening the witnesses, cannot be ruled out. The plea of '*alibi*' as taken by defence is a matter of trial and cannot be judged at this stage.

Therefore, considering the gravity of the offence, role of accused and since custodial interrogation of accused would be required for effective investigation, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to applicant. **Accordingly, the instant application seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed.**

Copy of the order be sent to concerned Ld. Magistrate/IO/SHO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

I may clarify that nothing expressed herein shall tantamount to an expression on the merit of present case.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:40:18
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Bail Application no: 1782
State Vs. Neeraj Tyagi@ Neha
FIR No: 254/20
Under Section:376/354D/506 IPC
PS: Burari

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

This is an application under section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of applicant/accused.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State
Dr. M.K Gehlot, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused
IO SI Ranvijay (through VC)

Reply filed by investigating Officer(IO). Copy of same supplied to other side electronically.

As per the reply filed by IO, the applicant had joined the investigation and after completion of investigation, she has been kept in Column no. 12 whereas co-accused who is her husband has been charge sheeted and put in column no. 11 in the instant case.

Ld. APP for State submits that the only allegations against applicant/accused are under Section 385/506 IPC and said offences are bailable in nature. It is further submitted by Ld. APP that a supplementary charge sheet shall be filed soon against the applicant for commission of said offences.

In view of the categorical submissions of Ld. APP, it is evident that there is no apprehension much less reasonable apprehension of accused being arrested in a non-bailable case in the instant case. Therefore, present application stands dismissed being non-maintainable.

Copy of the order be sent to SHO/IO and Ld. Defence counsel through official e-mail.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:39:30 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Crl Revision no. 196/20

Inderdeep Singh Kakkar vs State & Anr

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Fresh revision petition received by way of assignment. Let it be checked and registered.

Present: None

No urgency is pleaded in the instant case. Therefore, put up for consideration on 06.11.2020.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:43:51 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

Crl Revision no. 197/20

Inderdeep Singh Kakkar vs State & Anr

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Fresh revision petition received by way of assignment. Let it be checked and registered.

Present: None

No urgency is pleaded in the instant case. Therefore, put up for consideration on 06.11.2020.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:44:12 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Crl Revision no. 198/20

Inderdeep Singh Kakkar vs State & Anr

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Fresh revision petition received by way of assignment. Let it be checked and registered.

Present: None

No urgency is pleaded in the instant case. Therefore, put up for consideration on 06.11.2020.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:44:25 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

Crl Revision no. 200/20

Munish Hemrajani vs State & Anr

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Fresh revision petition received by way of assignment. Let it be checked and registered.

Present: None

No urgency is pleaded in the instant case. Therefore, put up for consideration on 06.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:45:05
+0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Crl Revision no. 201/20

Munish Hemrajani vs State & Anr

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Fresh revision petition received by way of assignment. Let it be checked and registered.

Present: None

No urgency is pleaded in the instant case. Therefore, put up for consideration on 06.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:45:25 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Crl Revision no. 199/20

Munish Hemrajani vs State & Anr

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Fresh revision petition received by way of assignment. Let it be checked and registered.

Present: None

No urgency is pleaded in the instant case. Therefore, put up for consideration on 06.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:44:49 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

SC No. 27581/2016

FIR No: 133 /2014

PS Darya Ganj

State Vs. Karan & ors.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

All accused on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 29.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on application U/s 311 Cr. P.C. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no.322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 04.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:50:40 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

SC No. 334/2017

FIR No: 161/2016

PS: Kamla Market

State Vs. Ashok Kumar Yadav & ors.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

All accused were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 04.02.2020 to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for consideration on death report of PW Manish. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 18.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:50:47 +0530

SC No. 938/2018

FIR No: 238/2014

PS: Prasad Nagar

State Vs. Bhagwan Dass @ Shankar & ors.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

All accused were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 12.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on charge. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 07.11.2020.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)**

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:51:06 +0530

**ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

Crl. Rv. No. 100/2019

Govind Ram (DHC) Vs. State

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for revisionist.

Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent.

The matter was lastly listed on 05.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for summoning of trial court record. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of revisionist, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 10.11.2020.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:50:56 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

SC No. 345/2019

FIR No: 236/2014

PS: Pratap Nagar

State Vs. Devanand & ors.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

All accused were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 12.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on charge. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 11.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:51:20 +0530

SC No. 9/2020

FIR No: 184/2019

PS: Pahar Ganj

State Vs. Swami Hari Om Giri

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Swami Hari Om Giri was on bail prior to lockdown period but he is not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 27.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on charge. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 12.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:51:27 +0530

SC No. 23/2020

FIR No: 42/2018

PS: Hauz Qazi

State Vs. Mukesh @ Abbu

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Mukesh @ Abbu was on bail prior to lockdown period but he is not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 26.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on charge. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.11.2020.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL** Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:51:33 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

SC No. 27645/2016

FIR No: 271/2014

PS: NDRS

State Vs. Shyam @ Ghanshyam

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Shyam @ Ghanshyam is on interim bail vide order 17.06.2020 but he is not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 29.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for prosecution evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 02.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:51:40 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

SC No. 28814/2016

FIR No: 147/2016

PS: Civil Lines

State Vs. Shiv Kumar & ors.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

All accused were on bail prior to lockdown period but they are not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 03.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for prosecution evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 12.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:51:46 +0530

SC No. 730/2018

FIR No: 284/2018

PS: Burari

State Vs. Anwar Khan

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused was on bail prior to lockdown period but he is not present today.

The matter was lastly listed on 16.01.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for prosecution evidence. Evidence is not to be recorded as per directions of Hon'ble High Court in view of restricted functioning of the District Courts due to current 'Pandemic'. Since none is present on behalf of accused, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 11.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:51:52 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)

**ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi**

17.08.2020

State Vs. Rishipal & ors. (SC No. 27762/2016)

State Vs. Deshraj (SC No. 28550/2016)

State Vs. Kishanpal @ Fauzi @ Raju (SC No. 592/2018)

State Vs. Hitender @ Chhotu (SC No. 327/2019)

FIR No: 356/2007

U/s 302/120B IPC

PS: Hauz Qazi

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of district courts has been suspended in terms of order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Rajesh Anand , Ld. Counsel for all convicts.

Convicts Deshraj, Bhisham @ Chintu, Kishanpal @ Fauzi, Hitender @ Chhotu, Deepak @ Chauda and Praveen Koli not produced from judicial custody.

Ld. Defence Counsel has sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by convict Deshraj. He has also sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by pairokar/mother of convict Bhisham in terms of his previous undertaking. Ahlmad/Reader is directed to take print out of same and place it on record.

Ld. Counsel seeks some more time to file affidavits (regarding means of convicts) in terms of previous directions. Let the same be filed within one week from today with advance copy to State. Since convicts are in custody, therefore if required, they may take assistance of Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority (for preparation of affidavits). Concerned Jail Superintendent shall accordingly

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:52:15 +0530

Contd..2/-

FIR No: 356/2007

coordinate with all the convicts and Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority for the needful.

Ld. APP for State also requests for some more time for filing of reports regarding the means of convicts and victim impact report in terms of previous directions. Let the same shall also be filed within one week from today with advance copy to defence. Now to come up for further proceedings on 25.08.2020. Copy of the order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:52:28 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

CA No. 74/2017

State Vs. Imran

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/appellant.

None for respondent.

The matter was lastly listed on 13.03.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of respondent, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 10.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:53:13 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Crl. Rev. No. 121/2019

Anjani Gupta Vs. State & ors.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for revisionist.

Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent no.1.

The matter was lastly listed on 06.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for further proceedings. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of parties, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 19.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:53:20 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

CA No. 443/2019

M Zahid Siddiqui Vs. State & anr.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for appellant.

Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent no.1.

Sh. Punit Bajaj, Ld. Counsel for respondent no.2 is visible, however not audible.

The matter was lastly listed on 06.02.2020 prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal as well as on application U/s 148 NI Act. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL
(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:53:27 +0530

CA No. 444/2019

M Zahid Siddiqui Vs. State & anr.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for appellant.

Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent no.1.

Sh. Punit Bajaj, Ld. Counsel for respondent no.2 is visible, however not audible.

The matter was lastly listed on 06.02.2020. prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal as well as on application U/s 148 NI Act. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:53:04 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

CA No. 445/2019

M Zahid Siddiqui Vs. State & anr.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for appellant.

Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent no.1.

Sh. Punit Bajaj, Ld. Counsel for respondent no.2 is visible, however not audible.

The matter was lastly listed on 06.02.2020. prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal as well as on application U/s 148 NI Act. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:53:36 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

CA No. 446/2019

M Zahid Siddiqui Vs. State & anr.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for appellant.

Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent no.1.

Sh. Punit Bajaj, Ld. Counsel for respondent no.2 is visible, however not audible.

The matter was lastly listed on 06.02.2020. prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal as well as on application U/s 148 NI Act. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:53:44 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

CA No. 447/2019

M Zahid Siddiqui Vs. State & anr.

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of District Courts has been suspended in terms of Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: None for appellant.

Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State/respondent no.1.

Sh. Punit Bajaj, Ld. Counsel for respondent no.2 is visible, however not audible.

The matter was lastly listed on 06.02.2020. prior to suspension of physical functioning of district courts. However, thereafter, matter could not be taken up due to suspension of work in terms of various office orders issued by Hon'ble High Court. The last of such Order No. 322/RG/DHC/2020 has been issued by Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court on 15.08.2020 thereby extending the suspension of physical functioning of courts till 31.08.2020 and directing to take up all the matters (except where evidence is to be recorded) through VC.

Previously, the matter was fixed for arguments on appeal as well as on application U/s 148 NI Act. No adverse order is being passed due to restricted functioning of courts in view of current situation of 'pandemic' and in view of office order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Ld. Registrar General, Delhi High Court. Since none is present on behalf of appellant, therefore, matter stands adjourned for purpose fixed on 17.11.2020.

ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:53:50 +0530

(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020

State Vs. Rishipal & ors. (SC No. 27762/2016)

State Vs. Deshraj (SC No. 28550/2016)

State Vs. Kishanpal @ Fauzi @ Raju (SC No. 592/2018)

State Vs. Hitender @ Chhotu (SC No. 327/2019)

FIR No: 356/2007

U/s 302/120B IPC

PS: Hauz Qazi

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of district courts has been suspended in terms of order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Rajesh Anand , Ld. Counsel for all convicts.

Convicts Deshraj, Bhisham @ Chintu, Kishanpal @ Fauzi, Hitender @ Chhotu, Deepak @ Chauda and Praveen Koli not produced from judicial custody.

Ld. Defence Counsel has sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by convict Deshraj. He has also sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by pairokar/mother of convict Bhisham in terms of his previous undertaking. Ahlmad/Reader is directed to take print out of same and place it on record.

Ld. Counsel seeks some more time to file affidavits (regarding means of convicts) in terms of previous directions. Let the same be filed within one week from today with advance copy to State. Since convicts are in custody, therefore if required, they may take assistance of Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority (for preparation of affidavits). Concerned Jail Superintendent shall accordingly

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:52:15 +0530

Contd..2/-

FIR No: 356/2007

coordinate with all the convicts and Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority for the needful.

Ld. APP for State also requests for some more time for filing of reports regarding the means of convicts and victim impact report in terms of previous directions. Let the same shall also be filed within one week from today with advance copy to defence. Now to come up for further proceedings on **25.08.2020**. Copy of the order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL

Date:
2020.08.17
14:52:28 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

State Vs. Rishipal & ors. (SC No. 27762/2016)

State Vs. Deshraj (SC No. 28550/2016)

State Vs. Kishanpal @ Fauzi @ Raju (SC No. 592/2018)

State Vs. Hitender @ Chhotu (SC No. 327/2019)

FIR No: 356/2007

U/s 302/120B IPC

PS: Hauz Qazi

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of district courts has been suspended in terms of order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Rajesh Anand , Ld. Counsel for all convicts.

Convicts Deshraj, Bhisham @ Chintu, Kishanpal @ Fauzi, Hitender @ Chhotu, Deepak @ Chauda and Praveen Koli not produced from judicial custody.

Ld. Defence Counsel has sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by convict Deshraj. He has also sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by pairokar/mother of convict Bhisham in terms of his previous undertaking. Ahlmad/Reader is directed to take print out of same and place it on record.

Ld. Counsel seeks some more time to file affidavits (regarding means of convicts) in terms of previous directions. Let the same be filed within one week from today with advance copy to State. Since convicts are in custody, therefore if required, they may take assistance of Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority (for preparation of affidavits). Concerned Jail Superintendent shall accordingly

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:52:15 +0530

Contd..2/-

FIR No: 356/2007

coordinate with all the convicts and Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority for the needful.

Ld. APP for State also requests for some more time for filing of reports regarding the means of convicts and victim impact report in terms of previous directions. Let the same shall also be filed within one week from today with advance copy to defence. Now to come up for further proceedings on 25.08.2020. Copy of the order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:52:28 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**

State Vs. Rishipal & ors. (SC No. 27762/2016)

State Vs. Deshraj (SC No. 28550/2016)

State Vs. Kishanpal @ Fauzi @ Raju (SC No. 592/2018)

State Vs. Hitender @ Chhotu (SC No. 327/2019)

FIR No: 356/2007

U/s 302/120B IPC

PS: Hauz Qazi

17.08.2020

Through video conferencing

Physical functioning of district courts has been suspended in terms of order no. 322/RG/DHC/2020 dated 15.08.2020 of Hon'ble High Court.

Present: Sh. Alok Saxena, Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Rajesh Anand , Ld. Counsel for all convicts.

Convicts Deshraj, Bhisham @ Chintu, Kishanpal @ Fauzi, Hitender @ Chhotu, Deepak @ Chauda and Praveen Koli not produced from judicial custody.

Ld. Defence Counsel has sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by convict Deshraj. He has also sent electronically the vakalatnama signed by pairokar/mother of convict Bhisham in terms of his previous undertaking. Ahlmad/Reader is directed to take print out of same and place it on record.

Ld. Counsel seeks some more time to file affidavits (regarding means of convicts) in terms of previous directions. Let the same be filed within one week from today with advance copy to State. Since convicts are in custody, therefore if required, they may take assistance of Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority (for preparation of affidavits). Concerned Jail Superintendent shall accordingly

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

**Digitally signed by
ANUJ AGRAWAL
Date: 2020.08.17
14:52:15 +0530**

Contd..2/-

FIR No: 356/2007

coordinate with all the convicts and Jail Visiting Counsel of District Legal Service Authority for the needful.

Ld. APP for State also requests for some more time for filing of reports regarding the means of convicts and victim impact report in terms of previous directions. Let the same shall also be filed within one week from today with advance copy to defence. Now to come up for further proceedings on **25.08.2020**. Copy of the order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent for compliance.

**ANUJ
AGRAWAL**

Digitally signed
by ANUJ
AGRAWAL
Date:
2020.08.17
14:52:28 +0530

**(Anuj Agrawal)
ASJ-03, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
17.08.2020**