

Delhi District Court

State vs . Jitender Etc on 21 December, 2012

Author: Mr. Sharad Gupta

:- 1- :-

IN THE COURT OF SH. SHARAD GUPTA
METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE
DWARKA COURTS, NEW DELHI.

STATE Vs. Jitender etc
P.S.: Binda pur
U/s: 457/380/411/34 IPC

JUDGEMENT

(a) The FIR No. of the case	:	209/09
(b) The date of commission of offence	:	29.06.2009 to 4.7.09
(c) The name of complainant	:	Smt. Asha Devi d/o Sh. Ranjeet singh R/o RZ B-17 Jeewan Park, Uttam Nagar, Delhi
(d) The name, parentage etc. of accused	:	1 Jitender @ Kaka s/o S Kanta Prasad R/o E 24 ,Partap Garden, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi 2 Satnam Singh @ Kake s/o Sh.Bhanwar Singh @Amar Singh R/o RZ-V2, Vishu Vihar, Uttam Nagar , New Delhi 3 Yoginder @ s/o Make Singh R/o RZ V 47, Vishu Viha

FIR No : 209/09

State Vs. Jitender etc

:- 2- :-

(e) The offence complained of/ proved	:	Uttam Nagar, New Delhi U/S 457/380/411 34 IPC
(f) The plea of accused	:	Pleaded not guilty
(g) The date of institution	:	03.09.09
(h) The final order	:	Convicted u/s 411 IPC
(i) The date on which order was reserved	:	17.12.2012
(j) The date of such order	:	21.12.2012
k) Brief statement of the reasons for the decision	:	

1 The allegation against the accused is that between 29.6.09 to 4.7.09 at

house No. D 8C, Binda pur Extension Uttam Nagar, New Delhi all the accused committed offence of lurking house trespass after sunset and before sunrise by entering into the said dwelling house for the purpose of committing theft of house hold articles, motorcycle bearing no. DL 4S ND 1579, computer and LPG Cylinder etc belonging to the complainant i.e Smt. Asha Devi and on 8.6.09 at the instance of all the accused recovery of motorcycle bearing no. DL 4SND 1579 alongwith spare parts was made while at instance of accused Yogender from his house at RZ V2, Vishu Vihar, Uttam Nagar , one computer monitor and UPS was recovered which articles all the accused retained in their FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 3 : possession knowing or having reason to believe the same to be stolen property. For the said offence FIR no.68/12 was registered. After completion of usual investigation, charge sheet was filed against the accused persons in court. 2 Copies of charge sheet were supplied to the accused in compliance of section 207 Cr.P.C. Charge for offence u/s 457/380/34 IPC and alternatively for offence under section 411 IPC was framed against the accused vide order dt. 05.03.2011 to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. 3 In order to prove the guilt of the accused person , the prosecution has examined as many as 8 witnesses in all. PW 1 Asha Devi is the complainant. PW 2 Ct. Ramdhari ,PW3 Constable Rajbir assisted the IO in investigation of the case. PW 4 Sh. Lalit Kumar is public witness in whose house theft was committed and was the registered owner of the stolen motorcycle. PW5 HC Rajender was MHCM at the relevant time. PW6 H C Mahabir joined investigation with IO H C Ramphal and got the case registered. PW 7 Retired ASI Hukan Chand was the duty officer who registered FIR no. 209/09 of this case and PW8 H C Ramphal is the IO of this case.

4 The version of the prosecution as adduced in its evidence

FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc
:- 4- :-

29.6.2009 PW4 Lalit Kumar alongwith his family had gone to his native

village. On 4.7.2009 PW1 Asha Devi, sister in law of PW4 came to know from his neighbours regarding theft in house of PW4. She went to house of PW4 and saw that the lock of the main door was broken and from inside the house motorcycle, computer, electric water motor, bathroom fittings were found missing. PW1 made PCR call and on receiving DD No. 28 A Ex. PW8/A , PW8 H C Ram Phal alongwith PW6 H C Mahavir reached at the spot. PW1 refused to give statement on that day by stating that the house belonged to PW4 who was out of station and she did not know what articles had been stolen. On 7.7.2009 PW1 gave her statement Ex. PW1/A regarding the incident. PW8 prepared rukka Ex. PW8/A and sent the same for registration of FIR through PW6 H C Mahavir. On the basis of rukka, PW7 ASI Hukan Chand registered FIR 209/09 Ex. PW7/A. PW8 HC Ram Phal prepared site plan Ex. PW8/C. In the evening on 7.7.2009 PW8 received DD No.60 B Ex. PW8/D regarding presence of three boys at V 2 Vishu Vihar alongwith stolen articles. PW8 HC Ram Phal alongwith PW3 Ct. Rajbir and PW2 Constable Ram Dhari went to house no. V2 Vishu Vihar, where all the accused were found to have separated parts of motorcycle bearing no. DL 4S

ND 1579 which were lying on the ground. PW8 took photographs Ex.X1 to X4 of the parts of the motorcycle . The parts of motorcycle were seized vide memo Ex. PW2/A. The disclosure FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 5 : statement of Jitender was recorded vide Ex. PW2/E and disclosure statements of accused Yogender and Satnam were recorded vide Ex. PW2/G and Ex. PW2/F respectively. Accused Yogender led police officials to his house and got recovered stolen computer articles which were seized vide memo Ex. PW2/I. Accused Jitender got recovered one stolen gas cylinder (pertaining to another case) which was seized vide memo Ex. PW 2/J and was arrested vide memo Ex. PW2/C, whereas accused Satnam and Yogender were arrested vide memos Ex.PW2/D and Ex. PW2/B. Personal search of accused Jitender , Satnam and Yogender was carried out vide memos Ex.PW3/C, Ex. PW3/A and Ex.PW3/B respectively. Case property was deposited in mal khana vide entry Ex. PW 5/A and accused Jitender pointed out the place where theft had been committed vide memo Ex. PW2/H. PW4 got released the case property Ex. P1 to P3 by furnishing superdarinama vide Ex. PW4/A and Ex. PW4/B. RC of stolen motorcycle has been proved as Ex.PW 4/C. PW4 Sh. Lalit Kumar also identified his articles at the P S.

5 Thereafter, PE was closed. Statement of the accused persons u/s 313 read with 281 Cr.P.C was recorded separately by putting entire incriminating circumstances appearing in evidence against him. The accused stated that they have been falsely implicated but they did not opt to lead any defence FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 6 : evidence and matter was accordingly posted for final arguments. 6 I have heard the Id. APP for the state as well as Ld. Defence counsel and perused the record. In this case, the prosecution was required to prove beyond reasonable doubt that between 29.6.2009 to 4.7.2009 all the accused committed lurking house tress pass at House no. D 8C , Binda pur Extension , Uttam Nagar, New Delhi for purpose of committing theft of house hold articles, bathroom fittings , motorcycle bearing no. DL 4S ND 1579 , computer and LPG cylinder etc and further more on 7-8.7.2009 from house no. RZ V 2, Vishu Vihar, Uttam Nagar, all the accused were found in possession of parts belongings to motorcycle bearing no. DL 4S ND 1579 and accused Yogender was found in possession of computer monitor and UPS which they dishonestly received or retained in their possession knowing or having reason to believe the same to be stolen property. To discharge its onus, the prosecution has examined as many as 8 witnesses. At the outset it has been observed that in the present matter, there is nothing on record to connect the accused with commission of offence u/s 380/457/34 IPC. No witness actually saw the accused persons committing theft. Further more, recovery in this case was effected on 8.7.2009 i.e about four days after the factum of theft in house of complainant was discovered. In these circumstances, even no presumption u/s FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 7 : 114 A Evidence Act that the accused persons were actually the persons who committed theft of the stolen articles can be raised in this case. It is proposed to consider the evidence brought on record in respect of commission of offence u/s 411 IPC. To establish the factum that theft actually took place in house of the complainant and FIR for the same was registered, the prosecution has examined PW 1 Asha Devi complainant and PW 4 Sh. Lalit Kumar, devar of complainant, who is the owner of the case property to establish its version. PW 1 Asha Devi has deposed that on 29.6.2009 her brother in law (devar) PW4 Lalit Kumar alongwith his children had gone to village Mehta Shah Pur, Distt Degu Sari, Bihar to attend the marriage function of his relative. On 4.7.09 the neighbours of her devar Lalit Kumar came to her and informed her regarding theft in her devar's house. On this information, she went to her devar's house and found that the lock of the main door of the house was broken and inside the house

motorcycle belonging to her devar was also found stolen. Various articles including Computer, electric water motor, bathroom fittings were also found missing. She informed to the police through PCR and police official recorded her statement on 7.7.09. She also informed about the same to her devar Sh.Lalit Kumar. PW4 Lalit Kumar has deposed that on 29.6.2009 he alongwith his family had gone to his native village. That on 4.7.2009 PW1 Asha Devi , sister in law of PW4 came to know from his neighbours regarding FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc :□8□:□theft in house of PW4. She went to house of PW4 and saw that the lock of the main door was broken and from inside the house motorcycle, computer, electric water motor , bathroom fittings were found missing. On 7.7.2009 PW4 came back and after checking found his motorcycle bearing no. DL 4SND□1579 monitor of dell company, UPS of PVS company were missing alongwith some other articles including bathroom fittings etc. The prosecution has also examined IO of the case, PW8 H C Ram Phal who has deposed that on 4.7.2009 he alongwith Ct. Mahavir reached at D 8C , Binda pur where PW1 Smt. Asha Devi met them and lock of the door was found broken. That on 4.7.2009 Smt. Asha Devi refused to give her statement by stating that the house belonged to her devar and she was unaware about the articles which was stolen from the house. DD No. 28 A Ex.PW8/A was kept pending. That on 7.7.2009 Smt. Asha Devi gave her statement Ex.PW1/A and PW8 prepared rukka Ex. PW8/A and sent PW6 H C Mahavir to P S for registration of FIR. The prosecution has also established that on 7.7.2009 PW7 retired ASI Hukam Chand registered FIR no. 209/09 vide Ex. PW7/A and made endorsement on the rukka vide Ex.PW7/B. The witnesses have corroborated each other in material particulars and their testimony inspires confidence. The version of the prosecution is also corroborated by record of DD No. 28A Ex. PW8/A dated 4.07.2009 recording factum of theft in house No.D8C, Uttam Nagar, Binda pur FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc :□9□:□extension. The DD entry establishes that information regarding the commission of theft at the said premises was received by the officials of PS Bindapur on 4.07.2009 itself and rules out the probability of the present case having been manipulated. The witnesses have corroborated each other in material particulars and the version of the prosecution inspires confidence. 7 It has been urged on behalf of the accused persons that there is delay in registration of FIR and the version of the prosecution is not believable. It appears in this context that PW8 H C Ram Phal has specifically stated that PW1 Smt. Asha Devi did not give any statement on 4.07.2009 as she was unaware about the exact articles stolen from house of her devar. The conduct of PW1 Smt. Asha Devi appears reasonable and credible even from view point of a reasonably prudent man similarly placed. It appears that the prosecution has been sufficiently able to explain the delay of about 3 days in registration of the FIR and the version of the prosecution cannot be doubted on this ground alone. The prosecution has thus established that theft took place in house of PW4 Lalit Kumar between 29.6.09 and 4.07.2009 and FIR no.209/09 was registered in this regard.

8 To establish factum of recovery of stolen articles from possession of

FIR No : 209/09

State Vs. Jitender etc

:- 10- :-

accused persons, the prosecution has inter alia examined PW2 Ct. Ramdhari, PW3 Ct. Rajbir and PW8 H C Ram Phal. PW8 H C Ram Phal has deposed that on receiving DD No. 60B regarding presence of three boys with stolen articles inside house no. RZ V2, Vishu Vihar, Binda pur, Uttam Nagar, he alongwith PW2 Ct. Ramdhari and PW 3 Ct. Rajbir went to the spot where they saw all the three accused persons inside the house. Accused persons had separated parts of motorcycle bearing no. DL 4SND-1579 which were lying on the ground. IO took photographs of the parts of the motorcycle with his personal camera and photographs have been proved as Ex. X1 to X4. All the three accused persons were interrogated and on interrogation all accused disclosed separately that they had committed theft of computer articles and motorcycle from house no. D 8C, Binda Pur Ext. Accused Yogender disclosed that he had kept the computer monitor and UPS at his house and could get the same recovered. The motorcycle and its parts were seized vide memo Ex. PW2/A. Disclosure statement of the accused were recorded vide memo Ex. PW2/G , E and Ex. PW2/F. Thereafter, accused Yogender led police officials to his house and got recovered computer articles which were seized vide memo already Ex. PW 2/I. The accused persons had already been arrested vide memo Ex. PW2/B, Ex. PW2/C and Ex. PW2/D and their personal search was carried out vide memos Ex. PW3/B, Ex. PW3/C and Ex. PW3/A. Accused Jitender also got recovered FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 11- One gas cylinder involved in another case from his house which was seized vide seizure memo Ex. PW2/J. PW2 Ct Ramdhari and PW3 Ct Rajbeer have deposed along the same lines and have corroborated the version of the prosecution. The version of the prosecution in this regard inspires confidence and the prosecution witnesses have corroborated each other in material particulars.

9 It has been urged on behalf of the accused persons that there are contradictions in testimonies of prosecution witnesses and version of the prosecution does not inspire confidence. Before proceeding any further it would be germane to refer to the case law on the point. It has been held in *Shahbuddin Abdul Kahlik Shaikh v. State of Gujarat*, 1995(3) R.C.R. (Criminal) 531 (SC) that where there are contradictions in statement of P.W., then before acting on evidence of such a witness court is required to first consider whether the contradiction was apparent or real, inconsequential or material, explainable or irreconcilable and acceptance of the claim of the witness was to depend on the answer thereon. It has similarly been held in *Hardeep v. State of Haryana*, 2002 Cri.L.J. 3939 (SC) as follows:

In the background of what has been indicated above, we may FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 12- now proceed to consider the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellant Mrs. Avinish Ahlwant on merit. In this connection it may be observed, in the criminal cases the Court cannot proceed to consider the evidence of the prosecution witnesses in a mechanical way. The broad features of the prosecution case, the probabilities and normal course of human conduct of a prudent person are some of the factors which are always kept in mind while evaluating the merit of the case. ...It is true, as observed by the Trial Court every contradiction or discrepancy may not necessarily be fatal to the prosecution case but it all depends on the facts and circumstances of the case, such discrepancies and contradictions have to be seen in the background of probabilities of the prosecution story and veracity of the prosecution witnesses. In case evidence of prosecution witnesses is above board and unimpeachable and inspires confidence, in that event discrepancies and contradictions here and there may have no value at all. (emphasis supplied) 10 It thus appears

to be the settled proposition of law that every FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : □13□:□ discrepancy occurring in prosecution evidence is not a contradiction and cannot be considered apart from the broad features of the prosecution case, the background of probabilities of the prosecution story and veracity of the prosecution witnesses. In case evidence of prosecution witnesses is above board and unimpeachable and inspires confidence, in that event discrepancies and contradictions here and there may have no value at all.

11 Coming to the factual matrix of the case, it appears that the ratio of Shahbuddin Abdul Kahlik Shaikh and Hardeep supra are fully applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case. It has first to be considered whether the contradictions sought to be argued are contradictions as such and then their bearing on the prosecution version has to be considered. 12 It has been urged that while PW4 Lalit Kumar has stated that he saw parts of his motorcycle at the P S at about 4 p.m on 7.7.2009, the version of the prosecution is that raid was conducted in the evening of 7.7.2009 itself at around 9.30 p.m. In this context it appears that PW4 Lalit Kumar was cross examined in court on 24.5.2012 i.e after about 2 years and 10 months approximately after the incident. Human memory is neither infallible nor FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : □14□:□perfect. It is but reasonable that with passage of time some of the details might get blurred in the mind of the witnesses and events might get distorted. Having regard to the natural course of things, the alleged contradictions pointed out by the accused does not seems to be a major contradictions and does not affect the veracity of the case of the prosecution, having regard to the broad features of the prosecution case. There is thus no merit in this argument of the accused.

13. It has been urged on behalf of the accused that while PW2 Ct Ramdhari had stated that they had entered the house by scaling its wall and that there is 10 feet wide street in front of the house and house is open on one side, whereas PW8 H C Ram Phal has stated that they knocked at the door and the door was opened and they thereafter went inside house no. V2, Vishu Vihar. In this context, it appears that on 7.7.2009, the raiding party conducted raid first at house no. V2, Vishu Vihar and thereafter in house of accused Yogender from where computer, monitor and UPS were recovered and lastly the raiding party went to house of accused Jitender at E 24, Pratap Nagarden, Uttam Nagar, Delhi from where the LPG cylinder of Indian company was recovered at instance of the accused. PW2 constable Ramdhari has stated in cross examination by counsel for accused Jitender FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : □15□:□that they had entered the house by scaling its wall. However, the question itself or its answer does not make clear as to about which house the PW was stating at that time. Interestingly, in his examination in chief, PW2 Constable Ramdhari has simply stated that at house no. V 2 Vishnu Vihar, Uttam Nagar they simply went and found the accused persons who had separated parts of the motorcycle. It thus appears that while the statement of the witness regarding the scaling of wall of the house is cryptic and ambiguous the same cannot be treated as a contradiction and same is of no use to the accused persons.

14 Furthermore, it has been urged on behalf of the accused persons that the time of arrest of the accused is not mentioned in their arrest memo and as such the version of the prosecution does not inspire confidence. To my mind mere non mentioning of time of arrest in the arrest memo is of no consequence especially when all the other particulars have been mentioned in the said memos. There is thus no merit in this argument of the accused. 15 Prosecution witnesses have been cross

examined at length but nothing materially damaging the version of the prosecution could be elicited on record. The version of PW 2 Ct. Ram Dhari and PW 3 Constable Rajbeer FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 16 has also been corroborated by the testimony of PW 8 H C Ram Phal by whom the accused persons were arrested with stolen motor cycle in parts and recovery of remaining case property was made. The prosecution has thus been able to establish that the stolen motorcycle was recovered from possession of all the accused persons on 7.07.2009 from house no. RZ V 2 Vishu Vihar Uttam Nagar and that the stolen UPS and monitor were recovered from possession of accused Yogender from his house at RZ V 47, Vishu Vihar Uttam Nagar Delhi.

16 It is now proposed to consider whether the accused received or retained the stolen articles knowing or reason to believe the same to be stolen articles. In this context, it appears that the accused were disassembling motorcycle bearing no. DL 4SND 579. The said motorcycle bore a unique registration number and was not an ordinary article of commerce. The accused knew at that time that the motorcycle did not belong to them but they have offered no explanation on record regarding their possession of the same. Similarly, the computer articles were retained by accused Yogender without any reasonable explanation for his possession of the said articles. In the peculiar circumstances of the case, it appears that all the accused persons dishonestly received or retained the said motorcycle bearing no. DL4SND 579 in their possession and accused Yogender FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 17 further dishonestly received or retained the stolen monitor and UPS in his possession knowing or having reason to believe the same to be stolen articles.

17 It has been urged on behalf of the accused that they have been falsely implicated in this case. It appears that there is nothing on record even by way of a suggestion to afford any reason as to why the accused were singled out by the complainant and falsely implicated, as alleged by the accused. There is no hint of any acrimony past or present between the complainant and the accused and in these circumstances, even from the standpoint of a reasonably prudent man, there is no reason to disbelieve the testimony of the complainant and the plea of false implication does not appear to be believable.

18 It has been urged on behalf of the accused that no public witness other than PW 1 Asha Devi and PW 4 Lalit Kumar was joined in this case by the IO and as such the prosecution version is unbelievable. It appears to be the settled law that merely because public witnesses have not been joined in investigation does not falsify the case of the prosecution. Reference might be made here to the pronouncement of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Tahir Vs FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc : 18 State 1996 SCC 515 wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has considered the value of the evidence of police officials and has observed as follows:

"No infirmity attaches to the testimony of police officials merely because they belong to police force and there is no rule of evidence which lays down that conviction cannot be recorded on the evidence of police officials, if found reliable, unless corroborated by some independent evidence. The rule of evidence however, only requires a more careful scrutiny of their evidence, since they can be said to be interested in the result of the case projected by them. Where the evidence of the police officials after careful scrutiny inspires confidence and is found to be

trustworthy and reliable, it can form the basis of a conviction and the absence of some independent witness of the locality to lend corroboration to their evidence does not in any way affect the credit worthiness of the prosecution witnesses."

19 When the test laid down in Tahir Supra is applied to the facts of the present case, it appears that the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses have remained credit worthy and believable. The version of the prosecution witnesses inspires confidence and the witnesses have corroborated each other in material particulars and the version of the prosecution has also been corroborated by the documentary evidence on record. It appears that the ratio of Tahir supra is fully applicable to the facts and circumstances of the FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc :□19□:□case and the non joining of public witnesses does not make the prosecution case unbelievable.

20 In view of the aforesaid discussion, the prosecution has discharged its onus to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt in resepct of offence under section 411 IPC. Accordingly, all the accused are convicted for offence u/s 411 IPC. However, prosecution has not been able to establish its case against the accused persons in respect of offence under section 457/380/34 IPC. Resultantly, all the accused persons are acquitted for offence under section 457/380/34 IPC giving them benefit of the doubt. Let the accused be heard on the quantum of sentence separately on 3.01.13.

ANNOUNCED IN THE OPEN
COURT ON 21.12.2012

(SHARAD GUPTA)
METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE
DWARKA COURTS, DELHI

FIR No : 209/09

State Vs. Jitender etc
:- 20- :-

IN THE COURT OF SH. SHARAD GUPTA

METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE
DWARKA COURTS, NEW DELHI.

State Vs Jitender etc
P.S.: Binda Pur
U/s: 380/457/411/34 IPC
FIR No. 209/09

ORDER ON SENTENCE

08.01. 2013

Present: Ld. APP for State.

All the three accused present in person on bail with their respective counsel.

Heard all the accused on the point of sentence.

Convict Jatinder submits that he is a young person of 21 years old and has to look after his aged parents and he is not previous convict. He has shown remorse and an inclination to rehabilitate himself in his life. He prays that lenient view may be taken against him. He also submits that he remained in J/C in this case for about 2 months and 10 days (w.e.f 8.7.09 to 18.9.2009) Convict Yogender submits that he is a young person of 20 years old. He further submits that his father is heart patient and he has to look after him. He further submits that he is first offender and has shown remorse and an inclination FIR No : 209/09 State Vs. Jitender etc :□21□:□to rehabilitate himself in his life. He prays that lenient view may be taken against him He also submits that he remained in J/C in this case for about one month and 7 days (w.e.f 8.7.09 to 14.8.2009).

Convict Satnam Singh submits that he is a young person of 22 years old and has shown remorse and an inclination to rehabilitate himself in his life and submits that he is not previous convict and prays for taking lenient view against him. He also submits that he remained in J/C in this case for about 1 month 23 days (w.e.f 8.7.2009 to 31.8.2009).

I have considered the arguments and gone through the record. Keeping in view the nature of allegation against the accused persons, it appears that although the accused have been convicted for offence u/s 411 IPC. However, the incidents of theft are on raise in the society and this court cannot be oblivious of its duty to society at large. No lenient view can be taken against any of the accused. Accused Jatinder is accordingly sentenced to undergo imprisonment for the period of 6 months for offence u/s 411 IPC. Benefit of section 428Cr.P.C is given to the accused.

Accused Yogender is accordingly sentenced to undergo imprisonment for the period of 6 months for offence u/s 411 IPC. Benefit of section 428Cr.P.C is given to the accused.

FIR No : 209/09

State Vs. Jitender etc
:- 22- :-

Accused Satnam Singh is accordingly sentenced to under

imprisonment for the period of 6 months for offence u/s 411 IPC. Benefit of section 428Cr.P.C is given to the accused.

At this stage, request has been made u/s 389(3) Cr.P.C. for suspension of sentence and grant of bail to the convicts to enable them to file appeal against order and judgment of the court . Heard. Since the convicts intend to prefer an appeal against the order of this court, they are hereby admitted to bail on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.15,000/□each with one local surety each in the like amount. Bail bonds ares furnished and accepted till 24.1.2013. Operation of sentence is stayed till 24.01.2013. It is clarified that nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrict or enlarge the period of limitation provided for filing of appeal against the order of this court. Copy of order be given to the convicts free of cost.

ANNOUNCED IN THE OPEN
COURT ON 8th January, 2013

(SHARAD GUPTA)
METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE
DWARKA COURTS, DELHI.

FIR No : 209/09

State Vs. Jitender etc