

SC No. 374/21

IA No. 01/22

State Vs.Sachin Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar @ Golu

FIR No. 351/2020

PS: Bhajanpura

U/s: 120-B,302/34 of IPC

& Sec. 25/27 of Arms Act

23.11.2022

Present: Sh. M.M.Khan, Ld. Counsel for the
applicant/accused Sachin Kumar @ Mukesh
Kumar @ Golu.
Sh. Sukhbeer Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
IO/Inspector Vinay Tyagi.

The matter is fixed for hearing arguments on the
application for grant of bail filed by this applicant/accused
Sachin Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar @ Golu.

I have heard the ld. Counsels for the parties.

Vide my separate detailed order of even date,
application for grant of bail filed by the applicant/accused has
been allowed.

(PAWAN KUMAR MATTO)
Addl. Sessions Judge (Special Judge NDPS)
North East/KKD Courts/Delhi/23.11.2022

SC No. 374/21

IA No. 01/22

State Vs. Sachin Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar @ Golu

FIR No. 351/2020

PS: Bhajanpura

U/s: 120-B,302/34 of IPC

& Sec. 25/27 of Arms Act

23.11.2022

**ORDER ON APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF BAIL
FILED BY THE APPLICANT/ACCUSED SACHIN
KUMAR @ MUKESH KUMAR @ GOLU.**

1. This order of mine will dispose of an application for grant of bail filed by this applicant/accused Sachin Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar @ Golu.
2. I have heard the Id. Counsels for the parties.
3. The Id. Counsel for this applicant/accused has submitted that this applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the offences alleged to have been committed by him. He has further submitted that public witnesses in the present case have been examined, but, they have failed to support the case of the prosecution. He has further submitted that this applicant/accused was arrested way back on 16.07.2020 and since then, he is behind bars. He has further submitted that it may take time in completion of trial and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping this applicant/accused behind bars for any longer and prayed for grant of bail.
4. On the other hand, the Ld. Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State has admitted that public witnesses examined in the court in the present case have failed to support the case of the prosecution, but, at the same time, he has also submitted that this applicant/accused is previously involved in number of cases, so, he does not deserve concession of bail and prayed for dismissal of this application.

In rebuttal thereof, Ld. Counsel for this applicant/accused has submitted that in one of the cases, this applicant/accused has been discharged and in other three cases, he is on bail and prayed for grant of bail.

5. I have given thoughtful consideration to the submissions made by the Ld. Counsels for the parties and perused the record.

6. No doubt, that the charges against this applicant/accused were framed U/sec. 120-B/302/34 of IPC, but, as this applicant/accused was arrested on dated 16.07.2020 and since then he is behind bars and view of huge pendency of the cases in this court, it may take time in completion of the trial and in considered opinion of this court, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping this applicant/accused behind bars for any longer therefore, this applicant/accused, namely, **Sachin Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar @ Golu** is ordered to be **released on bail, on his furnishing of of personal bond in the sum of Rs. 1,00,000/-** with one surety of the like amount and also subject to

the condition that he will come in the court on each and every date of hearing, he will not tamper with the prosecution evidence; he will not indulge in any criminal activity and in case, this accused will further indulge in any criminal activity, the prosecution will be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail of this accused. In the above said terms, the application for grant of bail filed by the applicant/accused stands **allowed.**

7. Copy of order be provided to the parties.

(PAWAN KUMAR MATTO)
Addl. Sessions Judge (Special Judge NDPS)
North East/KKD Courts/Delhi/23.11.2022