OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE (NORTH), ROHINI COURTS, DELHI.

ORDER

Apropos the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, in order to ensure proper compliance of directions passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (Criminal) 5191/2021 titled as "Satender Kumar Antil Vs Central Bureau of Investigation", the following Committee is hereby constituted with immediate effect:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Name of the Judicial Officer	Designated as	Concerned Branch
1.	Committee to monitor proper compliance of directions passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (Criminal) 5191/2021 titled as "Satender Kumar Antil Vs Central Bureau of Investigation".		Chairman	Judicial Branch
2.	Function of the Committee:- (i) to check the report submitted by the concerned courts as per the mandate.	Sh. Dhirendra Rana, Ld. Spl. Judge NDPS.	Member	
	(ii) to convene regular follow up meetings in this respect for monitoring the compliance.	La. Spi. Suage NDI S.		
3.	(iii) to ensure that the reports are correct and do not have any discrepancy and the correctness of the reports have been duly certified by the concerned Judicial Officer.	Ms. Neha Gupta Singh, Ld. CMM	Member	~

Note:-

- 1. If the Chairman of the Committee is not available for any reason, then the next senior most member of the Committee shall act as Chairman of the Committee.
- 2. Minutes of the Meeting is to be recorded by the Sr. PA/PA attached with the Chairman of the Committee.
- 3. All the correspondence with the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi shall be through the undersigned.

(SEEMA MAINI)

Principal District & Sessions Judge, North-District, Rohini Courts, Delhi. Dated

04

No.11891-11922_/F2N(4)/Admn.(North)/RC/2024 Copy forwarded for information and necessary action to :-

1. The Ld. Registrar General, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, New Delhi.

- 2. The Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (HQs), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
- 3. All the Judicial Officers of North District having criminal jurisdiction.
- 4. The Judicial Officers concerned.
- 5. The Branch In-Charge, Judicial Branch, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi.
- The Record Officer (RTI), North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi. 6.
- 7. The Web-Site Committee (English/Hindi), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
- The Web-Site Committee, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi for uploading on website. 8.
- 9. The Dealing Assistant, Facilitation Centre, Rohini Courts, Delhi.
- 10. The PRO/APRO, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi.
- 11. The Branch In-charge, R & I Branch, Rohini Courts, Delhi for uploading in LAYERS.
- 12. Personal Office of the undersigned.

Principal District & Sessions Judge, North-District, Rohini Courts, Delhi.

huara

ANNEXURE 'A'

PART A								
S.No District	compliance of the direction issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as "Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of	has been granted bail due to non- compliance of Section 41 and 41A CrPC [para	Whether courts are insisting for bail application while considering the bail application under Section 88, 170, 204 & 209 CrPC [para 73(e)]	Whether the mandate laid down in the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sidharth Vs. State of UP (2021) 1 SCC, 676 is being strictly complied with [para 73(f)]	Whether directions passed in Bhim Singh vs. UOI (2015) 13 SCC 605 for release of Undertrial Prisoners eligible for bail under section 436A of CrPC are being complied with [para 73(j)]	Whether the regular bail application are decided within 2 weeks. [para 73(k)]	Whether the anticipatory bail application are being decided within six weeks. [para 73(k)]	Whether the judgment in Satender Kumar Antil (Supra) is being applied to petitions U/s 438 c Cr.PC

Annexure - "B"

	PART B (giving District and Court wise)							
S. No.	District	No. of Undertrial Prisoners identified who are unable to comply with the bail condition (list be also annexed)[para 73(h)]	Whether the undertrial prisoners mentioned in column 3 have been informed about their right u/s 440 (2) CrPC	Total No. of application received under section 440(2) CrPC (list to be annexed)	Number of Regular bail application not decided within 2 weeks of institution	Number of anticipatory bail application not decided within six weeks of institution		

CLARIFICATIONS

ANNEXURE 'C'

S. No.	Name of the Judicial Officer(s)	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)
		In terms of directions contained in para 100.2 and 100.3, there is contrary stand that conditions in relation to Sections 41 and 41-A of Cr.PC and Arnesh Kumar (Supra) have been compied with, yet bail has been granted	directions contained in para 100.5, there is part complianes as per chart 'A', however certain courts have not complied with	contained in para 100.6, there is part compliance in the districts as per the affidavit.	directions contained in para 100.8 and 100.9, the High Court should inform this Court as to the steps taken for a	directions contained in para 100.9, it has been disclosed that bail applications under Section 440 of Cr.PC have not been received in relation to	Antil (Supra) is being applied to petitions U/s 438 of Cr.PC