

State vs. Sunil Lagun
FIR no. 2/16
PS Shalimar Bagh

01.07.2017

Present : Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Accused Danyal produced from J.C.

Accused Sunil Lagun on bail with counsel Sh. M.R. Saran.

Accused Rakesh Sachdeva, Renu Sachdeva and Ruhi Sachdeva on bail.

Accused Ronit and Meenakshi on bail with counsel Sh. Ashwin Vaish.

Accused Sunil Lagun has been released on bail and is accordingly present before the court.

Part arguments addresses on the point of charge by learned counsel for accused Sunil, Danyal and Ronit and Meenakshi. Part arguments have also been heard on behalf of the State.

Material annexed with the charge sheet is voluminous and Ld. Addl. PP needs some more time to go through the record and to submit detailed arguments.

Adjournment is also sought on behalf of accused Rajesh, Renu and Ruhi to address arguments on the point of charge as their counsel is not available today.

The accused Rajesh, Renu and Ruhi further submit that they have not been supplied with the copies of the supplementary charge sheet. However, perusal of the record reveals that copies of supplementary charge sheet have already been supplied on 21.11.2016 and have been accepted on behalf of their counsel. In fact, the present case has been committed to this court after scrutiny

...contd.

and after supplying a complete set of documents to the accused person and accordingly, the request of the accused persons is misplaced and declined.

Be listed for further arguments **on the point of charge on 05.09.2017**. ACP, DIU is directed to appear in person on the date fixed or to depute the IO, who will appear with file.

Application for bail of accused Danyal is pending and pressed. Order will be passed on the said application separately during the course of the day.

(Preeti Agrawal Gupta)
ASJ/NW-01/Rohini/Delhi
01.07.2017

State vs. Sunil Lagun
FIR no. 2/16
PS Shalimar Bagh

01.07.2017

Case file is taken up again on the bail application moved on behalf of accused Danyal

Present : Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. M.R. Sharan, Id. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

Perusal of the record shows that bail application of the applicant/accused was kept pending for consideration after filing of the supplementary charge sheet, which has been filed on 20.01.2017.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused prays for consideration of the bail application of the applicant/accused and submits that applicant/accused is in J.C for the last more than one year and charge sheet as well as supplementary charge sheet has already been filed. It is further submitted that accusations against the applicant/accused are baseless and false. It is also contended that all the other accused persons are on bail and as such, release of the accused on bail on parity is prayed for.

Ld. Addl. PP for the State opposes the bail application on the ground that applicant/accused is not only the accused in this case, but has also past criminal antecedents in another FIR u/s 376 IPC. It is stated that as per the allegations, applicant/accused is running a placement agency, through which, he forcibly got the minor girl i.e. prosecutrix placed in the house of the other co-accused, who exploited and ill-treated her.

The court has considered the nature of allegations against the accused, who is stated to be the owner of the placement agency, through whom, the co-accused Sunil, who is relative of prosecutrix, got her placed as a house-maid and was alleged to have made to work with exploitation and confinement in the house of other co-accused.

It is further considered that applicant/accused is in custody for more than one year and all other co-accused have already been admitted on bail prior to commencement of trial and even charges are still to be framed. In these facts and circumstances, the applicant/accused cannot be incarcerated and kept in custody indefinitely. The applicant/accused Danyal is admitted to bail on his furnishing a bail bond in a sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one sound surety in the like amount. It is further directed that applicant/accused shall not make any endeavour either to influence the prosecutrix or to threaten her or any public witness of the case and shall also not tamper with the prosecution evidence or hamper with the progress of the trial in this case.

Ordered accordingly.

(Preeti Agrawal Gupta)
ASJ/NW-01/Rohini/Delhi
01.07.2017