

IN THE COURT OF MS. VRINDA KUMARI,
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-07 (POCSO) / WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

Bail Application No.: 1259

State Vs. CCL 'A' @ 'K'

FIR No. : 134/2020

PS: Anand Parbat

U/s : 307/323/324/109/111/120-B/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms

Act

BAIL ROSTER

27.06.2020

Matter taken up in view of Covid-19 pandemic and national lockdown.

Bail Application U/s 439 Cr.P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant-accused for grant of regular bail.

Present: Ms. Promila Singh, Ld. Addl. P P for the State.
ASI Rajesh on behalf of IO.
Sh. H.R.Jha, Ld Counsel for applicant- accused.

Reply filed on behalf of IO.

Heard. Records perused.


It is submitted by ASI Rajesh that as informed by the IO, the injured has been discharged from the hospital on 12.06.2020. The



incident is dated 08.06.2020. ASI Rajesh submits that he is not aware of the facts of the case or whether CCL 'A' @ 'K' has had any other involvements or not.

IO is directed to appear in person with the police file before ~~the~~ ^{the} Court on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further consideration of the bail application on 30.06.2020.


(Vrinda Kumari)
ASJ-07 (POCSO), West/
THC/Delhi/27.06.2020

IN THE COURT OF MS. VRINDA KUMARI,
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-07 (POCSO) / WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

VIDEO CONFERENCING

State Vs. Priya
FIR No. : Not Known
PS: Nihal Vihar
U/s : Not Known

BAIL ROSTER

27.06.2020

Matter taken up in view of Covid-19 pandemic and national lockdown.


Bail Application U/s 438 Cr.P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Ms. Promila Singh, Ld. Addl. P P for the State
Shri Veer Singh, Ld Counsel for applicant through CISCO
Webex Video Conferencing.


Heard. Records perused.

No reply of the IO has been received.

Issue notice of the instant bail application to SHO PS Nihal Vihar who shall submit the reply to the present application for anticipatory bail positively on 30.06.2020.



Put up for further consideration through Video Conferencing on 30.06.2020.


(Vrinda Kumari)
ASJ-07 (POCSO), West/
THC/Delhi/27.06.2020

IN THE C

IN THE COURT OF MS. VRINDA KUMARI,
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-07 (POCSO) / WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

Bail Application No.: 1171

State Vs. Vipin Kumar

FIR No. : 102/2020

PS: Ranhola

U/s : 304B/498A/34 IPC

BAIL ROSTER

27.06.2020

Matter taken up in view of Covid-19 pandemic and national lockdown.

Bail Application U/s 439 Cr.P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant-accused for grant of regular bail.


Present: Ms. Promila Singh, Ld. Addl. P P for the State.
ASI Banwari Lal on behalf of IO.
Ms. Urvashi Bhatia, Ld Counsel for applicant- accused.

Reply on behalf of the IO is already on record.

Heard. Records perused.


ASI ^{Banwari} ~~Banwari~~ Lal submits that he is not aware of the facts of the case and the IO has been transferred.

Let 1st IO be summoned through SHO PS Ranhola for the next date of hearing.



2
Let the complainant be ^{also} summoned for the next date of hearing through SHO PS Ranhola.

Put up for same and further consideration of the bail application on **01.07.2020**. TCR be also summoned for the said date.


(Vrinda Kumari)
ASJ-07 (POCSO), West/
THC/Delhi/27.06.2020

1

IN THE COURT OF MS. VRINDA KUMARI,
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-07 (POCSO) / WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

Bail Application No.: 1283

State Vs. Harkesh Yogi

FIR No. : 624/2020

PS: Ranhola

U/s : 308/34 IPC

BAIL ROSTER

27.06.2020

Matter taken up in view of Covid-19 pandemic and national lockdown.

Second Bail Application U/s 439 Cr.P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant-accused for grant of regular bail.

Present: Ms. Promila Singh, Ld. Addl. P P for the State.
IO SI Sedhu Yadav with police file.
Ms. Mamta Bhardwaj, Ld. Counsel for
applicant – accused.

Reply filed on behalf of the IO.

Heard. Records perused.

Ld. Counsel for applicant – accused submits that applicant – accused has been falsely implicated in this case whereas the applicant – accused was not even present at the spot on the said date. It is also submitted that the applicant – accused had two previous involvements.

✓

2

He was sentenced to payment of fine of Rs.200/- in FIR No. 424/18 PS Jaitpur u/s 283 IPC. It is also submitted that the applicant – accused was acquitted in FIR No. 451/16 PS Janak Puri u/s 392/394/482/411/34 IPC. It is also submitted that the incident in question is dated 05.06.2020 but FIR was registered on 07.06.2020. Further, applicant – accused was arrested on the basis of his own disclosure statement.

Ld. Addl. PP for State assisted by the IO has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground of gravity of offence.

I have considered the rival contentions.

IO submits that the applicant – accused had suffered injury in the head and he has placed a request before the concerned doctor to give his opinion on the nature of injury. The MLC with opinion has not been received till now.

Reply of the IO shows that complainant / injured, namely Gopal used to be a member of the gang of the applicant – accused. When the complainant defected and started spying on the gang of the applicant – accused, it infuriated them and the applicant – accused alongwith his accomplices decided to teach a lesson to the complainant. Applicant – accused and his accomplices attacked the complainant with *latthis* and iron rods.


The other accomplices / associates of the applicant – accused are yet to be arrested.

A handwritten signature consisting of a stylized 'M' or 'W' shape, followed by a long arrow pointing to the right.

It has come up that prior to the instant bail application, another bail application had been moved on behalf of the applicant – accused on 23.06.2020 which was dismissed. This material fact has not been disclosed in the instant bail application. Copy of the order vide which the said bail application was dismissed has also not been placed on record.

In the facts and circumstances of the case as discussed above, gravity of offence as also in view of the non-disclosure of material fact in the bail application, the Court is not inclined to admit the applicant – accused Harkesh Yogi to bail. **The second application of applicant – accused Harkesh Yogi for grant of regular bail is dismissed.**

At request, copy of order be given DASTI to Ld. Counsel for applicant – accused as well as the IO. A copy be also sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for information. }


(Vrinda Kumari)
ASJ-07 (POCSO), West/
THC/Delhi/27.06.2020

IN THE COURT OF MS. VRINDA KUMARI,
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-07 (POCSO) / WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

Bail Application No.: 1226
State Vs. Saurav Khatri
FIR No. : 70/2020
PS: Ranhola
U/s : 302/120B IPC

BAIL ROSTER

27.06.2020


Matter taken up in view of Covid-19 pandemic and national lockdown.

Bail Application U/s 439 Cr.P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant-accused for grant of regular bail.

Present: Ms. Promila Singh, Ld. Addl. P P for the State.
SI Sedhu Yadav, on behalf of IO.
Sh. Gaurav Sharma, Ld. Counsel for complainant.
Sh. R.V.Kaushik, Ld Counsel for applicant- accused.

Heard. Records perused.


Ld. Counsel for applicant – accused submits that charge sheet in the instant case has been filed and has also been committed and is now listed before Ld. ASJ Sh. Vishal Singh, West District on 29.06.2020.



At this stage, both Ld. Counsels submit that the matter be heard through Video Conferencing.

In these circumstances, let the present bail application be placed before the concerned Court on 29.06.2020 for hearing through Video Conferencing.

At request, copy of order be given DASTI to Ld. Counsel for applicant – accused, Ld. Counsel for complainant as well as the IO.


(Vrinda Kumari)
ASJ-07 (POCSO), West/
THC/Delhi/27.06.2020

IN THE CO

Bail Applica

FIR No. 70

PS : Ran

UIS: 302

State V

5.06

IN THE COURT OF MS. VRINDA KUMARI,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-07 (POCSO), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

FIR No.: 816/2019
PS : Nihal Vihar
U/s : 307/34 IPC &
Section 25/27 Arms Act
State Vs. Inderjeet
Bail Application No. 1282

BAIL ROSTER

27.06.2020

Matter taken up in view of Covid-19 pandemic and national lockdown.

Second Bail Application U/s 439 Cr.P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant-accused Inderjeet for grant of regular bail.

Present: Ms. Promila Singh, Ld. Addl. P P for the State.
Shri Manoj Goswami, Ld. Counsel for applicant-accused. IO/SI Amit Nara in person.

Reply filed by the IO.

Heard. Records perused.

Ld. Counsel for applicant-accused submits that supplementary charge-sheet against the applicant-accused has still not been filed. The main accused Narender is in JC since January 2020. It is submitted that applicant-accused has been falsely implicated and he has

Contd/-

no previous involvement. It has also been argued that the applicant-accused was arrested on the basis of disclosure statement of the main accused Narender.

Ld. Addl. PP for the State, assisted by the IO, has vehemently opposed the bail application of the applicant-accused on the ground that one of the accused, namely, Sumit Malik is absconding and it is a case of gang rivalry.


I have considered the rival contentions.

Conducting of TIP of the applicant-accused is not such a material change in circumstance as would warrant enlarging the applicant-accused on bail. The Report of the IO shows that TIP of the applicant-accused was conducted and the injured has identified the applicant-accused as one of the assailants. The co-accused Sumit Malik is still absconding and the supplementary charge-sheet in respect of the applicant-accused is yet to be filed.

The record shows that it is a case of gang rivalry. On the date of incident, i.e., 06.12.2019, the accused persons fired several shots at the injured. Out of several rounds fired at the Complainant/injured, three hit him.

The first bail application of the applicant-accused was dismissed on 11.06.2020. There is no material change in circumstance since then.

In these circumstances and in view of gravity of offence, the



Contd/-

Court is not inclined to
The
Interject

Court is not inclined to enlarge applicant-accused on bail.

The second bail application of the applicant-accused Inderjeet is, accordingly, dismissed.

Copy of the Order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for applicant-accused, concerned Jail Superintendent as well as IO of the case.



(Vrinda Kumari)
ASJ- 07 (POCSO)/
WEST/THC/Delhi/
27.06.2020

IN THE COURT OF MS. VRINDA KUMARI,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-07 (POCSO), WEST
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI

FIR No.: 602/20
PS : Ranhola
U/s : 307/34 IPC
State Vs. Ramu Yadav
Bail Application No. 1281

BAIL ROSTER

27.06.2020

Matter taken up in view of Covid-19 pandemic and national lockdown.
Bail Application U/s 439 Cr.P.C. moved on behalf of the applicant-
accused Ramu Yadav.


Present: Ms. Promila Singh, Ld. Addl. P P for the State.
Shri S K Rajput, Ld. Counsel for applicant- accused.

Reply of the IO filed.

Heard. Records perused.

Ld. Counsel for applicant-accused submits that the injured as well as the applicant-accused are friends and they are exploring the possibility of settlement. Adjournment has been sought on this ground.

At request, put up for further consideration of the instant bail application on **02.07.2020**.


(Vrinda Kumari)
ASJ- 07 (POCSO)/
WEST/THC/Delhi/

27.06.2020