

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CrI.M.C.No.2386/2020**

Judgment reserved on : 22.02.2021

Date of decision : 04.10.2021

SUMAN SOLANKI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Sunil Dalal, Sr.Advocate
with Mr. Sandeep Chaudhary
and Mr. Ghanish Bagaria,
Advocates.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Kamal Kumar Ghei, APP
for State with SI Kamal Kohli.
Mr.Yogesh Goel, Mr.Aaditya
Gambhir and Mr. Himanshu
Reddy, Advocates for R-2.

AND

+ **CrI.M.C.No.2412/2020 and CrI.M.A. No.17028/2020**

JOGINDER SINGH LATHER

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Jasbir Singh Malik,
Advocate

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Kamal Kumar Ghei, APP
for State with SI Kamal Kohli.
Mr.Rajesh Baweja, Advocate
for complainant.

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.10.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

JUDGMENT

ANU MALHOTRA, J.

1. The petitioners of the two petitions, CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 and 2412/2020 have assailed the order dated 2.12.2020 of the learned Link Judge/Additional Sessions Judge (Electricity) (North-West), Rohini Courts, Delhi, whereby in relation to the FIR No. 59/2019, Police Station EOW registered under Sections 406/420/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, in relation to the Bail Appln. No. 3959/2020 filed by Ram Niwas Lather, the learned Additional Sessions Judge held that as a part of the cause of action arose in the North as well as the North-West District, both the Courts had jurisdiction to decide the applications filed by them in accordance with law and thus held that the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge (NW), Rohini, had jurisdiction to hear the Bail Appln. No. 3959/2020 filed in relation to FIR No. 59/2019, Police Station EOW of the applicant Ram Niwas Lather arrayed as the respondent no.2 to CrI.M.C No. 2386/2020.

2. The submissions that had been made before the learned Additional Sessions Judge (Electricity) North-West, on behalf of the complainant who is the petitioner of CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020, presently, under consideration before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, were to the effect that the jurisdiction to hear the bail application lay with the North District and not the North-West District. Vide the impugned order dated 2.12.2020, the learned

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.11.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

Additional Sessions Judge (Electricity) (North-West) had fixed the hearing of the bail application on merits for the date 4.12.2020. In as much as, vide order dated 4.12.2020 in CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020, presently under consideration, the operation of the impugned order dated 2.12.2020, of the learned Additional Sessions Judge (Electricity) North-West, Rohini Courts, in relation to Bail Appln. No. 3959/2020 had been stayed, in the circumstances, as the hearing of the anticipatory bail application had thus been consequently stayed it was directed that till the next date of hearing, the applicant of the Bail Appln. No. 3959/2020 arrayed as respondent No.2 to the CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 be not arrested by the Investigating Agency subject to his not leaving the country. The said interim order is presently in existence.

3. The petitioner of CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020, i.e., the complainant in relation to the case FIR No. 59/2019, Police Station EOW, apart from seeking the setting aside of the order dated 2.12.2020 of the learned Additional Sessions Judge (Electricity) North-West, Rohini Courts on the grounds that the learned Additional Sessions Judge had exceeded jurisdiction by the said order also prayed that the respondent no.2 be directed to file the bail application before the North District, Rohini Courts.

4. The petitioner of CrI.M.C. 2412/2020, Joginder Singh Lather, another co-accused in case FIR No. 59/2019, PS EOW, apart from seeking that the order dated 2.12.2020 of the learned ASJ (Electricity) North-West to the extent that it held that the Court of the North District, Rohini Courts too had jurisdiction to entertain the bail

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.12.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

application be set aside, also sought the setting aside of the order dated 5.12.2020 in Bail Appln. No. 4030/2020 which bail application had been filed by the applicant thereof i.e., the petitioner herein, Joginder Singh Lather, the petitioner of CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020, in as much as vide order dated 5.12.2020, the learned Additional Sessions Judge (Electricity) North-West, Rohini Courts had observed that in view of the submissions that had been made before the Court that this Court had stayed the proceedings before the learned Additional Sessions Judge (Electricity) North-West, thus no interim relief could be granted by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, North-West on the application filed seeking the anticipatory bail.

5. The petitioner of CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020 , Joginder Singh Lather further sought that the learned Additional Sessions Judge, (Electricity) North-West be directed to decide the bail application of the applicant, i.e., the petitioner herein, i.e. Joginder Singh Lather in FIR No 59/2019, Police Station EOW Mandir Marg, as it had exclusive jurisdiction.

6. Vide order dated 9.12.2020 in as much as the learned Additional Sessions Judge, (Electricity) North-West had declined the grant of interim relief to the applicant thereof, i.e. Joginder Singh Lather, the petitioner of CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020 qua his application seeking the grant of anticipatory bail in view of the order dated 4.12.2020 of this Court in CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020, the matter was directed to be renotified for 21.12.2020 till which date, it was directed the petitioner of CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020, Joginder Singh Lather be not arrested till the said date subject to his not leaving the country and

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.12.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

joining the investigation of the case as and when required, which interim order is presently in subsistence.

7. The status report dated 5.12.2020 was submitted by the State in CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 and the status report dated 18.12.2020 was filed by the State in CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020. A reply was also filed on behalf of Sh. Ram Niwas Lather arrayed as respondent No.2 to CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 to contend that it is only the Court falling in the North-West District which had jurisdiction to decide the bail application of the applicant Ram Niwas Lather arrayed as respondent No.2 to CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020.

8. Submissions were made on behalf of the State by the learned APP for State and on behalf of the petitioner of CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 by the learned counsel as also on behalf of the respondent No.2 of CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020 by his learned counsel.

9. As per the status reports in both the petitions placed on record as submitted by the State, FIR No. 59/2019 Police Station EOW dated 4.4.2019 under Sections 406/420/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, was registered on the complaint of Ms. Suman Solanki (petitioner of CrI.M.C.2386/2020) and others against M/s Prabhu Shanti Real Estate Pvt. Ltd. and its Directors, namely, Bijender Singh Lather, Joginder Singh Lather (the petitioner of CrI.M.C. No 2412/2020), Ram Niwas Lather (the respondent No.2 of CrI.M.C. No 2386/2020), Sajjan Singh Beniwal and Ms. Bhawna Lather and other officials of the accused company. The complainants had contended that they had booked flats/spaces in a residential project, namely, PDM Hi-Tech Homes, situated at Section 3A, Bahadurgarh, District

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.11.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

Jhajjar, Haryana, launched by the accused company, i.e., M/s Prabhu Shanti Real Estate Pvt. Ltd in 2012 and as per the status report it was alleged that in order to allure the home-buyers, the accused company showed glitzy brochures, published advertisements and installed big hoardings across Delhi and Bahadurgarh. The complainants were stated to have visited their office of M/s Prabhu Shanti Real Estate Pvt. Ltd at Ground Floor, Flat No.-2, Block-D, Pocket-5, Sector-15, Rohini, North Delhi, Pitampura, Delhi where the accused made several representations and gave false assurances to the complainants claiming that they had absolute ownership of the entire land and that the land is free from all kinds of encumbrances. As per the status report, the accused company had also represented that it had sufficient funds to complete the entire project within the stipulated time without the requirement of any loan. As per the status report, the directors and the other persons of the accused company had made the complainants/home buyers believe that the amount invested by them was for the specific purpose of purchasing of flats and that their monies would be kept as an entrustment with the accused company and would be solely utilized for the construction of the proposed project. As per the submissions through the status report as submitted by the State, it had been alleged that in 2012, the Directors of the accused company had assured the complainants that they would hand over the flats within the next two and a half years and believing this representation of the accused directors, the complainants had booked their flats in the proposed project at their Delhi based office of the accused company.

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT GHAI
Signing
Date: 04.10.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

10. As per the status report the accused company had collected more than Rs.155 crores from the innocent home buyers/complainants and had siphoned off the same for their other projects in furtherance of their dishonest intention and did not utilize the same on the project related to the complainants due to which the accused company could not handover the possession of the flats on time.

11. As per the status report in Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020, dated 5.12.2020 submitted under the signatures of the ACP, Economic Offences Wing, Mandir Marg, it had been submitted to the effect that the case had been registered on the complaint of Ms. Suman Solanki, (the petitioner of Crl.M.C. No.2386/2020), and she had initially met with the directors of the accused company M/s Prabhu Shanti Real Estate Pvt. Ltd. at the office BU-1, SFS Flats, Pitampura, New Delhi, and that most of the payments were deposited at their registered office at Flat No-2, Ground Floor, Block-D, Pocket-5, Sector- 15, Rohini, North Delhi, in relation to the project PDM Hi-Tech Homes and all further correspondence was made at his registered office of the accused company. As per this status report submitted in Crl.M.C. No.2386/2020, it was submitted on behalf of the State that after the registration of the FIR, most home buyers had filed their complaints against the accused company with the same allegations at the Police Station KN Katju Marg, New Delhi and the same were transferred to the EOW and that all the complaints had been clubbed with this case (an apparent reference to the complaint of Suman Solanki, petitioner of Crl.M.C. No 2386/2020).

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.11.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

12. It was submitted further that this is a multi-victim case and most of the victims met the accused directors at the registered office of accused company, i.e., Flat No-2 , Ground Floor, Block-D, Pocket-5, Sector-15 , Rohini, North Delhi and had deposited their payments there.

13. The said status report dated 5.12.2020 of the State is inter alia to the effect that one of the accused Bijender Singh Lather filed an anticipatory bail application before the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, (Electricity) North-West, which was dismissed and that another accused Joginder Singh Lather, i.e., the petitioner of CrI.M.C. No 2412/2020 filed an anticipatory bail application before the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, (Electricity) North-West, Rohini, which was dismissed as withdrawn and that the complainant filed two applications seeking the monitoring of the case and for deciding the role of other accused persons which applications were filed by the complainant before the Court of the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Rohini Courts, and that the said applications are stated to be pending there. It is stated further through the status report submitted by the State in CrI.M.C. No.2386/2020 that during the investigation on 24.2.2020, on an application of the Investigating Officer, the learned CMM (North) Rohini Courts issued non bailable warrants against the accused directors, namely, Sajjan Singh Beniwal, Joginder Singh Lather (petitioner of CrI.M.C. No 2412/2020), Bijender Singh Lather and Ram Niwas Lather (respondent no.2 of CrI.M.C. No. 2389/2020) and on the submission of the Investigating

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.11.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

Officer, the learned CMM, Rohini Courts, had issued fresh NBWs against all the accused directors on 17.8.2020.

14. The State further submitted that on 16.10.2020 the process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. was issued by the learned CMM, North, Rohini Courts, against all the accused persons, namely, Sajjan Singh Beniwal, Joginder Singh Lather (petitioner of CrI.M.C. No 2412/2020), Bijender Singh Lather and Ram Niwas Lather (respondent no.2 of CrI.M.C. No. 2389/2020). It was also submitted through this status report that Sajjan Singh Beniwal filed an anticipatory bail application before the Court of the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, (Electricity) North-West, which application was transferred to the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, North, Rohini Courts and was dismissed on 15.10.2020. The second anticipatory bail application filed by Sajjan Singh Beniwal before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, North District was also dismissed on 18.11.2020 . It was also submitted by the State that the accused Bijender Singh Lather who had been granted interim protection by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 2.11.2020 in SLP(CrI.) Diary No. 208/2020 which was then pending there, (which petition has since been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court) had also filed an application seeking the cancellation of the proceedings under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C., 1973, before the Court of Learned CMM, North, Rohini Courts.

15. It was also submitted by the State through the status report dated 5.12.2020 submitted in CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 that during the course of investigation the record was put up which indicated that the

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.12.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

registered office of the accused company M/s Prabhu Shanti Real Estate Pvt. Ltd, is at Flat No.2 Ground Floor, Block-D, Pocket-5, Sector-15, Rohini, North Delhi.

16. The respondent No.2 arrayed to the Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020 Ram Niwas Lather in his reply to Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020 submitted that in column 5 of the FIR, the place of occurrence had been shown as Pitampura, New Delhi, which falls in the North-West District, New Delhi and that the Inquiry Officer had also formed an opinion that the place of occurrence fell in Pitampura in North-West District, New Delhi and submitted that the jurisdiction to hear the bail application lay with the North-West District and inter alia the respondent No.2 to Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020 submitted that if the complainant, i.e., the petitioner of Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020 had not filed her complaint in the Court of the CMM, North, Rohini Courts, the Investigating Officer would not have taken non-bailable warrants nor initiated any proceedings under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C., 1973 in the Court of the CMM, North, Rohini Courts.

17. It was submitted by the respondent No.2 to Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020 that an application filed by one of the complainants for transfer of the bail application filed by Joginder Singh Lather, i.e., the present petitioner to Crl.M.C. No. 2412/2020 was dismissed vide order dated 9.9.2020 of the District & Sessions Judge, North-West Rohini Courts, New Delhi. It was inter alia submitted on behalf of the respondent No.2 to Crl.M.C. No.2386/2020, to the effect that there was no objection from the Investigating Officer nor from the complainant that the Court of the North-West District had no

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.10.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

jurisdiction to entertain and decide the bail application. The respondent No.2 to CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 thus submitted that the complainant was delaying and misleading the proceeding by raising frivolous objections in respect of the jurisdiction of the Court.

18. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts vide the impugned order dated 2.12.2020 had observed on the aspect of the territorial jurisdiction as under:-

"Ld. Defence Counsel states that the jurisdiction lies with the North West District; whereas the Ld. Counsel for the complainant has argued that the jurisdiction lies with the North District. Ld. Defence counsel has relied upon the buyer agreement dated 30.06.2013 where the registered office of the company has been shown as BU-1, SFS Flats, Pitampura, New Delhi. It is argued that in the FIR also, the place of occurrence of offence has been shown as Pitampura, which falls within the jurisdiction of North-West District and this court has the jurisdiction over the present anticipatory bail application. It is further argued that at the time, when the present offence was allegedly committed by the accused persons, the registered office of the company was at Pitampura, which lies within the jurisdiction of North-West District. It is further argued that the I.O. in his reply has no objection on the point of jurisdiction of this court to hear the present application. Ld. Defence counsel has referred to the FIR and state that it is nowhere mentioned in the FIR that the offence was committed in the North-District.

On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the complainant has argued that the Company shifted its office to Rohini from Pitampura and the complainant even visited the said office at Rohini and the same has been mentioned in the FIR. It is further stated that as per the statement of the

Signature
Not Verified

 Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.12.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

account/payment advice was issued to the complainant from the office situated at Sector-15, Rohini, Delhi and the offence of cheating continued at the office of situated at Sector-15, Rohini, Delhi, which lies within the jurisdiction of North District.

On rival submissions, it is observed here that initially the complainant approached the PS KNK Marg, which lies in the jurisdiction of North District, Rohini Court, Delhi. After that, the SHO KNK Marg referred the present complaint and other complainants relating to the same cause of action to the EOW of the Delhi Police. Thereafter, the present FIR was registered u/s. 420/406/120 B IPC, PS EOW. The I.O submitted that as per the details of the Registrar of Companies, the office of the accused company has been shown in Sector-15, Rohini, Delhi, which lies within the jurisdiction of North District, Delhi.

The reply of the I.O shows that during investigation, NBWs against the accused persons of the present FIR were obtained from the court of Ld. CMM, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi and raids were conducted for execution of NBW. It is further stated in the reply that proceedings u/s. 82 Cr. P.C. have been initiated against the absconded accused persons before the court of Ld. CMM, North, Rohini Courts, Delhi. It is also relevant to mention here that one of the accused person namely Sajjan Singh Beniwal approached Ld. ASJ, North District for anticipatory bail, which was however dismissed; whereas the other accused persons namely Sh. Bijender Singh Lather and Joginder Singh Lather approached Ld. ASJ, North West District for seeking anticipatory bails, which were later on dismissed.

It is observed here that the buyer seller agreement between the present accused and the complainant was registered at Pitampura office. Later on, the accused company shifted its address to Sector 15 Rohini. The complainant also visited the registered office at Sector 15, Rohini, Delhi which has been

Signature
Not Verified

 Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT GHAI
Signing
Date: 04/10/2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

presently the registered office on the record of the Registrar of Companies. The investigation is still going on in the present case.

*The proceedings with regard to the investigation such as issuance of NBW and proceedings u/s. 82 Cr. P.C are being done by the Ld. CMM, North District, Rohini, Delhi. Nevertheless, the offence of cheating, criminal breach of trust, misappropriation of property etc. can be inquired into and tried by the court where any part of the cause of action arises. At this stage of investigation, preference to any part of the cause of action over the other one for the purpose of territorial jurisdiction ought not to be given inasmuch as the Buyer Agreement between the accused company and the complainant was executed at BU -1, SFS Flats, Pitampura which lies in the territorial jurisdiction of the North-West District, whereas the payment scheduled was issued to the complainant from Rohini office which falls in the jurisdiction of the North District. Since, the part of the cause of action arose at the North as well as the North-West District, therefore, both the courts have jurisdiction to decide the applications filed before them in accordance with law. Accordingly, **this court has jurisdiction to hear the present bail application.**"*

19. As per the FIR, it has been stated to the effect:

3. The brief of the complaint is that in the year 2008, Prabhu Shanti Real Estate Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "the Company") announced a residential project "P.D.M. Hi-Tech Homes" consisting of more than 435 flats in more than 6 towers on the land ad-measuring 8.976 acres in sector-3A, Bahadurgarh, (District Jhajjar, Haryana. To allure the home-buyers, glitzy brochures and advertisement were published, and big hoardings were put at various places across Delhi and Bahadurgarh. Besides this, the phone calls were also used to be made and SMS were also sent to me and other home buyers to invite us to invest in their property and to purchase flats in their project.

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.10.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

.....
....
....

7. I believed the representation given by them initially at their head office at Delhi, Pitampura, thereafter, at the site of the project 'at Bahadurgarh and thus fell pray and parted with the money to book a flat at their Delhi Office and in this manner by now I have paid Rs.59,93,189/- (Fifty Nine lacs Ninety three thousand one hundred eighty nine only) and since 2012 up till this time the company did not provide a roof to me and my children.

20. The impugned order dated 2.12.2020 of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, North-West has categorically stated that the FIR was lodged giving the place of occurrence at Pitampura, New Delhi, which was within the North-West District, however the accused company had given its office at Sector-15 Rohini, Delhi, which falls within the jurisdiction of North District, Delhi and that whereas the complaint was registered at the Pitampura office, the accused company had shifted its address to Sector-15, Rohini, which was also shown to be the registered office on the record of the Registrar of Companies of the accused.

21. Furthermore, it is essential to observe that in terms of Section 462 of the Cr.P.C., 1973, which reads to the effect:

"Section 462 in The Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973

462. Proceedings in wrong place. No finding, sentence or order of any Criminal Court shall be set aside merely on the ground that the inquiry, trial or other proceedings in the course of which it was arrived at or passed, took place in a wrong sessions division, district, sub- division or other local area, unless it appears that such error has in fact occasioned a failure of justice."

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT GHAI
Signing
Date: 04.11.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

apparently, there has been no failure of justice that has occasioned to either of the petitioners vide the impugned order dated 2.12.2020 in Bail Application Nos.3959/2020 and 4030/2020.

22. It is apparent thus as rightly held vide the impugned order dated 2.12.2020, in as much as the cause of action had arisen both in the North-West and North Districts of Delhi, both the Courts having jurisdiction to hear the bail applications of the North-West and North Districts have jurisdiction to hear the said bail applications arising out of FIR No. 59/2019, Police Station EOW and thus, it is held that there is no infirmity in the impugned order dated 2.12.2020 that has been assailed in both the petitions, i.e., Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020 and 2412/2020.

23. However, in as much as the proceedings in relation to the investigation such as issuance of NBW and proceedings under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C., 1973, have been initiated in the Court of the learned CMM, North District, Rohini Courts and as the registered office of the accused company is situated at Sector-15, Rohini, Delhi which falls within the jurisdiction of the North District, Delhi and as per the status report dated 5.12.2020 submitted by the State in Crl.M.C. No. 2386/2020, the complainant had filed two applications regarding the monitoring of the case and deciding the role of other accused persons which was pending before the Court of the CMM (North) coupled with the factum that as per the said status report all further correspondence that had been made by the complainant had been at

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.12.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

the registered office of the accused company being Flat No.2, Ground Floor, Pocket 5, Sector-15, Rohini (North), Delhi, in view thereof, the proceedings in relation to the bail application Nos. 3959/2020 and 4030/2020 qua FIR No. 59/2019, Police Station EOW, Mandir Marg have necessarily to be dealt with by the Court having jurisdiction over the North District, Rohini Courts.

24. Thus qua CrI.M.C. No 2386/2020, though as already observed herein above, it is held that there is no infirmity in the impugned order dated 2.12.2020 of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, North-West, Delhi, it is directed that it is open to the respondent No.2 Ram Niwas Lather to move an application seeking grant of bail in relation to the FIR No. 59/2019, Police Station EOW, Mandir Marg registered under Sections 406/420/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, by date 11.10.2021 till which date the interim restraint against arrest of the respondent No.2 to CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 Ram Niwas Lather subject to his not leaving the country, shall continue. The application, if any, filed by Ram Niwas Lather arrayed as respondent no.2 to CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 seeking grant of bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over the North District, Delhi in relation to the FIR No. 59/2019, EOW would be decided on its own merits. It is made expressly clear that the interim restraint from arrest granted vide order dated 4.12.2020 and extended herein thereafter during the pendency of CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 and extended as directed hereinabove till the date 11.10.2021 shall automatically stand vacated w.e.f. 12.10.2021. The CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 is disposed of accordingly.

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.10.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

25. As regards the prayer in CrI.M.C. No 2412/2020, filed by Joginder Singh Lather, as already observed herein above there being no infirmity in the impugned order dated 2.12.2020, it is held that there is no infirmity in the impugned order of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, North-West, holding to the extent that the Courts of the North District, Delhi also have jurisdiction to entertain the bail applications presented. As regards the further prayer made vide this petition CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020 seeking that the bail application of the applicant Joginder Singh Lather bearing Bail Registration no. 4030/2020 be disposed of by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, North-West, it is directed to the effect that Joginder Singh Lather may move an application seeking grant of bail in relation to the FIR No. 59/2019, Police Station EOW, Mandir Marg registered under Sections 406/420/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, by date 11.10.2021 till which date the interim restraint against arrest of the petitioner Joginder Singh Lather to CrI.M.C. No 2412/2020 subject to his not leaving the country and subject to his joining the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer, shall continue. The application, if any, filed by Joginder Singh Lather petitioner to CrI.M.C. No. 2412/2020 seeking grant of bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over the North District, Delhi in relation to the FIR No. 59/2019, EOW would be decided on its own merits. It is made expressly clear that the interim restraint from arrest granted vide order dated 4.12.2020 and extended herein thereafter during the pendency of CrI.M.C. No. 2386/2020 and extended as directed hereinabove till the date 11.10.2021 shall automatically stand vacated

Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT CHAI
Signing
Date: 04.10.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

w.e.f. 12.10.2021. The Crl.M.C. No. 2412/2020 is disposed of accordingly.

ANU MALHOTRA, J.

OCTOBER 04, 2021/SV



Signature
Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SUMIT GHAI
Signing
Date: 04.10.2021
17:36:05
This file is
digitally signed by
PS to HMJ ANU
MALHOTRA.

Crl.M.C. Nos.2386/2020 & 2412/2020

Page 18 of 18