

CNR No. DLCT11-000748-2026

CC No. 44/2026

FIR No. 5/2016

PS : Vigilance

State Vs Insp. Saroj Sharma

28.07.2026

Present : Sh. Pramod Kumar, Ld. PP for State.
ACP namely Raj Kumar alongwith IO/Insp. Nipun Gupta are present in person.

Heard. Perused.

As per report of Ahlmad, the documents filed with the chargesheet, are as per list of documents annexed therewith.

ATR alongwith certain annexures, in terms of last order, has been filed.

Considering the submissions made by ACP and IO concerned, notices issued to them stand discharged.

Arguments on the point of cognizance heard. Record perused.

In brief, the case of prosecution, as mentioned in the chargesheet and the material filed therewith, is that on 11.07.2026, complainant namely Sh. Surender Sharma had filed a complaint at Vigilance Branch, through whatsapp online, wherein it was, *inter alia*, alleged that false FIR was filed by his wife against him and his parents and the IO of said FIR, was asking him to give bribe of Rs.2,00,000/- to remove the name of his parents from the said FIR, and also that he had proofs against them and also that IO had threatened him to put them all behind bars. Name of said IO was disclosed as Saroj Sharma posted in PS GTB Enclave, East Delhi. Alongwith said whatsapp message, the complainant also sent an

audio clip, wherein the alleged police official namely Saroj Sharma was asking him to arrange for money by hook or crook.

The aforesaid complaint was got lodged, vide DD No. 05A dated 11.07.2016 at PS Vigilance and same was marked to Insp. Pankaj Sharma for enquiry. During such enquiry, complainant Sh. Surender Sharma had produced his mobile phone make Samsung with internal memory and without SIM. Said memory card was having several recorded conversations between complainant and accused Insp. Saroj Sharma, who was posted at PS GTB Enclave. No only this, the complainant had also produced one audio CD make WRITEX containing audio conversations and transcripts dated 09.07.2016, 10.07.2016 and 11.07.2016. Said mobile phone, CD and documents were seized, vide production-cum-seizure memo, by Insp. Pankaj Sharma. Further, Insp. Pankaj Sharma also recorded statement of complainant Sh. Surender Sharma on 19.08.2016, wherein it was, *inter-alia*, alleged by the complainant that on 11.07.2016, he had filed a complaint through whatsapp helpline at Vigilance Branch and had also sent an audio recorded clip from his mobile phone. Insp. Saroj Sharma of PS GTB Enclave, who was IO of case FIR No. 268/2016, u/s 498A/406/34 IPC, registered on the complaint of his wife, had demanded Rs.1,00,000/- for removing the names of his parents and brother from said FIR; and had threatened him that in case of his failure to pay the said amount, she would put him behind bars. Later on, alleged Insp. Saroj Sharma agreed to receive the bribe money of Rs.50,000/- and asked him to come back with the said amount. When he told her on telephone that it would be difficult to arrange said money as he had already taken loan of Rs.9,00,000/-

for his marriage, she asked him to arrange the demanded amount by any means. He had recorded all the telephonic conversations which took place between him and alleged Insp. Saroj Sharma in which she was demanding money, in his mobile phone.

On the basis of aforesaid statement of complainant Sh. Surender Sharma, his mobile phone containing recorded audio conversations, CD containing recorded audio conversations and its transcriptions, the details of which are mentioned in the chargesheet itself, alleged Insp. Saroj Sharma was also got joined during Vigilance Enquiry. After completion of such enquiry, it was found that Insp. Saroj Sharma of PS GTB Enclave *i.e.* accused herein, had demanded bribe from the complainant for providing undue favour to him in case FIR No. 268/2016, u/s 498A/406/34 IPC & Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, by abusing her official position. Accordingly, with the approval of Senior Police Officers, FIR in question in respect of offences u/s 7/13(1)(d) of PC Act, came to be registered on 21.09.2016 and the investigation was entrusted to Insp. Rajesh Kumar.

It is the case of the prosecution that during investigation, Insp. Rajesh Kumar recorded statements u/s 161 Cr.P.C. of witnesses; obtained consent of complainant Sh. Surender Sharma on 04.10.2016 and of alleged Insp. Saroj Sharma on 13.11.2016, for obtaining their voice samples, however, alleged Insp. Saroj Sharma denied to give her voice sample on 30.05.2017. On 24.07.2018, alleged Insp. Saroj Sharma @ Saroj Bala again refused to give her voice sample before the Court of the then Ld. CMM, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi. Complainant namely Sh. Surender Sharma also did not cooperate during

investigation and failed to appear before FSL on various dates for taking his voice sample, on which, Kalandara u/s 174 Cr.P.C. was filed against him before the Court of law. Thereafter, complainant gave his voice sample on 14.08.2018 at FSL, Rohini, Delhi. His statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C. was also got recorded before the Court on 18.08.2018.

It is further the case of the prosecution that later on, alleged Insp. Saroj Sharma gave her consent for voice sample and accordingly, her voice sample was also obtained in FSL, Rohini, Delhi, on 07.01.2020. Thereafter, all the exhibits were got deposited in FSL, Rohini, Delhi, for analysis and report. As per FSL report dated 23.08.2019, exhibit marked as 'MP1' was not responding with Universal Forensic Extraction Device (UFED) of M/s Cellebrite Mobile Synchronization Ltd., Israel and other Forensic tools (Software/Hardware), as such no data could be retrieved from the said exhibit. However, in FSL report dated 24.07.2023, it was opined that voice exhibits of speakers marked 'Exhibit-Q1' and 'Exhibit-S1' are voice of the same person *i.e.* Sh. Surender Sharma; and voice exhibits of speakers marked 'Exhibit-Q2' and 'Exhibit-S2' are voice of same person *i.e.* W/SI Saroj Sharma (accused herein).

It is further the case of the prosecution that IO had collected CAFs & CDRs of the relevant mobile connection numbers, alongwith certificates u/s 65B of Indian Evidence Act; seized the relevant document; and also recorded statements u/s 161 Cr.P.C. of relevant witnesses, during investigation. Requisite Sanction, as envisaged u/s 19 POC Act, was also accorded by the

Competent Authority against accused Saroj Sharma (the then Inspector) and same is also filed alongwith the Chargesheet.

Having considered the submissions made by Ld. PP for State and keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, as noted hereinabove and the material, including audio recordings, FSL result, statements recorded u/s 161 Cr.P.C. of relevant witnesses and the Prosecution Sanction u/s 19 of P.C. Act granted against accused Saroj Sharma (the then Inspector), the Court is satisfied that there is sufficient material available on record, disclosing commission of offences u/s 7/13(1) (d) of POC Act, against accused Saroj Sharma W/o Sh. Karan Singh. Accordingly, cognizance is taken in respect of said offences.

As per chargesheet, the accused was not arrested during investigation. Let accused Saroj Sharma @ Saroj Bala (the then Inspector) be summoned for next date of hearing.

Put up on **01.09.2026** for appearance of accused.

(Vidya Prakash)
Special Judge, PC Act (ACB)-01
RACC, New Delhi
28.07.2026^(a)