

IN THE COURT OF M. P. SINGH, SPECIAL JUDGE
(PC ACT), CBI-02, ROUSE AVENUE COURT COMPLEX,
NEW DELHI

CC No. 66/2020
CNR No. DLCT 11-000296-2020
RC No. 16(A)/2020/CBI/ACB/New Delhi



Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)

versus

Sanjeev Kumar, s/o Sh. Bachan Singh
r/o A-401, Police Housing Complex
Rohini, Sector-11, Delhi

.... Accused

Date of institution – 02.11.2020
Arguments concluded on – 13.10.2025
Judgment pronounced on – 08.12.2025

JUDGMENT

1. On 18.03.2020 FIR (Ex. PW16/A) under section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (for short 'PC Act') against Sanjeev Kumar, a Delhi Police personnel posted at Police Station Economic Offences Wing (for short 'EOW'), Mandir Marg, Delhi came to be registered on the basis of a written complaint dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) of one Sanjay Gupta. The said complaint Ex. PW7/A is as under:

To, 17.03.2020
The Superintendent of Police,
CBI, ACB
New Delhi

Sub: Complaint against Sanjeev Kumar, Sub Inspector,
Delhi Police, Economic Offences Wing, Section-VI, Mandir
Marg, New Delhi & Mr Rajiv Gupta, s/o of Shri L. R. Gupta,
R/o 4, Palam Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi

Sir,

1. I am a law abiding citizen and a permanent citizen of New Delhi. I am successful businessman and owner of vast chunk of lands and properties in New Delhi.

2. Sub Inspector Sanjeev Kumar, Delhi Police, EOW, Mandir Marg was an Investigation Officer against me in a FIR No. 0148 dated 02.07.2018 and he demanded a bribe of Rs 10 Lacs from me on around Diwali of 2018, during investigation which I refused to pay. Consequently he recently has filed a Charge Sheet against me in the said FIR. I am contesting the said matter and have filed quashing of the same in W. P. (C) No 1344 of 2019¹ which is now pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi at New Delhi.

3. That during the investigation in the above said matter, without any rhyme or reason, SI Sanjeev Kumar summoned my elder brother Mr Rajiv Gupta who has been on loggerheads with me and my father since 1997.

4. Mr Rajiv Gupta was summoned by SI Sanjeev Kumar, he got another opportunity to harass and victimise me. He has filed a false complaint² against me in EOW, Mandir Marg. Strangely the said complaint, was also investigated by SI Sanjeev Kumar.

5. That on 05.03.2020 SI Sanjeev Kumar demanded an amount of Rs 30 Lacs in total to investigate the complaint of Mr Rajiv Gupta in my favour. The amount of Rs 30 Lacs, also includes an amount of Rs 10 Lacs which he demanded while investigating FIR No. 0148 of 2018.

It is submitted that I be protected from SI Sanjeev Kumar and action in accordance with law be taken for demanding the bribe of Rs. 30 Lacs from me.

Thanking You

Yours Sincerely,

Sanjay Gupta

S/o Shri L. R. Gupta,

R/o 47, Amrita Shergill Marg, New Delhi

+91-9810152142

2. To verify genuineness of the allegations, verification exercise was carried out on 17.03.2020 and 18.03.2020 by PW15 Inspector Shyam Rai, CBI-ACB along with SI Vikrant Tomar in

¹ This is in fact W. P. (Crl.) 1344/2019. According to the records available on the website of the Delhi High Court, the FIR bearing number 148/2018, registered at Police Station Economic Offences Wing (PS EOW), came to be quashed on 09th April 2021 on the ground that the accused and the complainant therein had settled their dispute in the sum of Rs. 28,58,02,566/-.

² This is a complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA) of Rajeev Gupta addressed to DCP (EOW), Delhi against his brother Sanjay Gupta (complainant).

the presence of complainant/PW7 Sanjay Gupta and independent witness, namely, PW10 Ramnath Meena.

3. In the verification conducted on 17.03.2020 complainant and accused spoke over the phone through WhatsApp on multiple occasions (once at 14:35 hours, twice at 14:43 hours, and then once at 18:32 hours), but the demand on latter's part could not verified, hence the verification was kept open for 18.03.2020. It is pertinent to mention that in the last call on 17.03.2020 it was mutually decided that they would meet the next day at 17:00 hours. Phone conversation between the two recorded in Memory Card through the Digital Voice Recorded (for short 'DVR') was signed and sealed with CBI seal and marked as '*Q-1 in CO-22/2020*'. Verification report dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/B) was prepared, wherein the verification proceedings were incorporated. Thus, what is certain, and is in fact the prosecution case itself, that no demand for bribe was made on 17.03.2020.

4. The next day, that is, 18.03.2020, complainant and accused Sanjeev spoke to each other over the phone through WhatsApp at about 16:32 hours and decided to meet in latter's office in about 30 minutes time. This call was placed in the presence of the independent witness, with complainant's phone on speaker mode, and the conversation was recorded onto Memory Card via DVR. Complainant thereafter proceeded to accused's office with the independent witness and the other verification team members remained at a safer distance. Complainant then entered accused's office with a DVR

containing a Memory Card concealed inside his pocket, and returned about twenty minutes later to recount the incident to the team. The recording in DVR is stated to have confirmed the demand of bribe of Rs. 30 lacs. The complainant informed his team that, upon entering accused's office, he first submitted a reply to a notice earlier served upon him by the accused, after which both of them stepped outside, where he attempted to negotiate a reduction in the bribe amount; however, accused insisted that the sum would not be reduced, though he was willing to accept it in two or three instalments or even over two to three years, ultimately revealing that he had demanded a bribe of Rs. 30 lacs and had agreed to accept a portion of it on 19.03.2020. Independent witness PW10 Ramnath Meena witness narrated that he saw the complainant talking to a person wearing a mask, but could not overhear the conversation between them. The recorded conversation between complainant and the accused recorded in the Memory Card through DVR was signed and sealed with CBI seal and marked as '*Q-2 in CO-22/2020*'. Verification report dt. 18.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/F) was prepared, wherein verification proceedings were incorporated.

5. Following verification, an FIR (Ex. PW16/A) under section 7 of PC Act was registered against the accused, after which a trap was subsequently laid. On 19.03.2020 a trap team was constituted comprising of PW16 Inspector Bhanwar Lal Jat as Trap Laying Officer (for short 'TLO), two independent witnesses, namely, PW10 Ramnath Meena and PW13 Sanjeev Kumar, complainant PW7 Sanjay Gupta and other trap team members. At around 1:50 pm, the trap team assembled at CBI-

ACB office in Delhi, where the objective of laying a trap on the accused was explained to all members, followed by a reading and explanation of the complaint dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) and the verification reports dt. 17.03.2020 and 18.03.2020. Complainant produced currency notes totalling Rs. 4 lacs (199 government currency notes of Rs. 2,000/- denomination and 4 government currency notes of Rs. 500/- denomination) to be used as bribe amount. The serial numbers and denominations of the government currency notes were separately recorded (Annexure A); the notes were then treated with phenolphthalein powder, and a demonstration was conducted for all the trap team members. After taking complainant's personal search, the bribe amount of Rs. 4 lacs smeared with phenolphthalein powder was put in his right side coat pocket. Pre-trap proceedings were conducted and incorporated in a Handing Over Memo dt. 19.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/J) in the CBI office.

6. In furtherance of the Handing Over Memo dt. 19.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/J), a WhatsApp call was made from complainant's mobile phone to the accused at about 16:15 hours and the conversations were recorded in the Memory Card duly fitted in the DVR. In the WhatsApp conversation, accused informed the complainant of his presence in his office and invited the complainant to meet him there. Subsequently, the CBI trap team consisting of CBI officials, the two aforementioned independent witnesses, and the complainant departed for accused's office at around 16:50 hrs and arrived near Mandir Marg Police Station at approximately 17:05 hrs.

7. Upon reaching the location, the DVR containing the memory card was placed in inner pocket of complainant's coat in switched-on mode. TLO instructed the complainant to hand over the tainted bribe amount only on specific demand of the accused. Complainant then entered the EOW premises, located near Mandir Marg Police Station, to meet the accused. The TLO (PW16 Inspector Bhanwar Lal Jat) and independent witness PW13 Sanjeev Kumar discreetly followed the complainant into the compound of EOW office and took their positions inside, while the remaining trap team members positioned themselves both inside and outside the EOW premises in a similarly discreet manner.

8. Upon reaching EOW office premises, complainant made a WhatsApp call to accused, during which the accused informed him that he was coming out. About 5–7 minutes later, accused emerged from his office and met the complainant within the EOW premises. TLO and the independent witness Sanjeev Kumar (PW13) saw the complainant meeting one person, who was later identified as the accused. Following some discussion, both proceeded to the rear side of the EOW building and entered the residential complex of Mandir Marg Police Station. During their discussion, complainant mentioned about the reply that he had submitted, to which the accused responded that he had not yet seen it. Complainant then informed the accused that he had brought the bribe amount. Initially, the accused suggested that the complainant keep the money with himself and that he (accused) would collect it when needed. However, complainant expressed his inability to hold such a large amount of cash,

prompting the accused to make a hand gesture and accept the money with his left hand. The complainant then sought verbal confirmation by saying, “*Sir, maine aapko chaar lakh रुपये diye,*” to which the accused replied, “*Haan, koi nahi.*” The accused then left the spot.

9. This was then followed by the complainant giving a missed call to TLO and another call to Inspector Pramod Kumar Tanwar on their mobile phones at around 17:22 hours. He informed that accused had demanded and accepted the bribe at the rear side of the EOW office. Acting on this information, Inspector Pramod Kumar Tanwar alerted the other team members and rushed inside the EOW police compound, followed by rest of the trap team. Upon arrival, Inspector N.C. Nawal retrieved the DVR with the memory card from the complainant and switched it off. The complainant then informed them that the accused was approaching from the direction of the residential flats. Other team members also entered the EOW Mandir Marg compound. Around the same time, the accused was spotted coming from the parking area of the residential compound near police station Mandir Marg. As the CBI team moved to apprehend him, the accused attempted to flee by jumping over parked cars, scaling the iron fence of EOW compound wall, and exiting onto the main road. The CBI team pursued, chased, and apprehended the accused on the main road. He was then brought back to the residential compound at the rear side of EOW Mandir Marg, where the TLO confronted him with the allegation of demanding and accepting the bribe. Accused denied the accusation and was subsequently directed to sit inside the CBI vehicle.

10. Right and left hand washes of the accused were taken separately in two freshly prepared solutions of sodium carbonate and water, both of which turned light pink. The washes were collected in two separate bottles, each of which was individually signed, sealed, and properly marked as '*RHW in RC 16(A)/2020 and Right Hand Wash*' and '*LHW in RC 16(A)/2020 and Left Hand Wash*'. At the time of his apprehension, the accused was holding a tissue paper, which he used in an attempt to wipe his hands before discarding it on the road near the CBI vehicle. The TLO recovered the tissue paper in the presence of both independent witnesses. A wash of the tissue was taken in a freshly prepared solution of sodium carbonate and water, which turned pink. The said wash was stored in a separate bottle which was signed, sealed and marked as '*Tissue Paper Wash in RC-16(A)/2020*'.

11. Upon further inquiry qua the tainted bribe money received from the complainant, the accused again denied any involvement. Meanwhile, other team members searched for the tainted bribe money within the EOW compound, particularly along the route the accused attempted to flee, but it could not be located. The TLO (PW16 Inspector Bhanwar Lal Jat) interrogated the accused, during which a car key was found in his possession and a Registration Certificate (RC) of a Maruti RITZ car bearing number DL6CP 4531 was recovered from his pant pocket. Upon searching the residential premises, the vehicle was located parked in the parking area of Block A within the residential complex. The independent witnesses opened the car using the key. Search of the car was conducted. Independent

witness PW13 Sanjeev Kumar found a white envelope in the back side cover pocket of co-driver's seat. Upon opening the envelope, he retrieved cash from inside. Both independent witnesses counted the recovered tainted bribe amount and confirmed it to be Rs. 4 lacs. They also verified the number and denominations of the government currency notes as listed in Annexure A of the Handing Over Memo (Ex. PW7/J) and found them to be accurate. As a confirmation of its correctness, the independent witnesses signed each page of Annexure-A. The said government currency notes (tainted bribe money) were kept back in the very same white envelope, which was then placed inside a brown envelope and sealed with CBI seal and marked as '*Trap money in RC-16(A)/2020*'.

12. In the search of accused's car, one more white envelope was recovered from a backpack bag lying on the co-driver seat, containing Rs. 1,02,500/- in denomination of 197 government currency notes of Rs. 500/- and 40 notes of Rs. 100/-. The said amount was put back in the same white envelope and placed inside a brown envelope and marked as '*Rs.1,02,500/- amount recovered in a car of accused in RC-16(A)/2020*'. The said amount was also seized, as the accused could give no satisfactory reply regarding its source.

13. Wash of left front seat back pocket of accused's car from where the tainted bribe money was recovered was taken in a freshly prepared solution of Sodium Carbonate and water and which turned pink. The wash was stored in a bottle which was signed, sealed and marked as '*LFSBPW in RC16 A/2020*'

denoting left front seat back pocket wash.

14. A rough site plan (Ex. PW7/L) showing the position of the accused, complainant, independent witnesses and CBI trap team members was prepared at the spot.

15. An investigation copy of the memory card installed in the DVR, which contained the recorded conversations between the accused and the complainant in the trap proceedings, was prepared. Its contents were played and listened to, confirming the demand and acceptance of bribe of Rs. 4 lacs by accused from the complainant. The memory card was then removed from the DVR, sealed with the CBI seal, and marked as '*Q-3 in RC 16(A)/2020*'. Accused was then arrested at about 21:30 hours vide Arrest cum Personal Search Memo Ex. PW10/C and was asked to give his specimen voice voluntarily, which he declined.

16. SI Vikrant Tomar took screenshots of WhatsApp call logs from the phones of both the accused and the complainant. He used internet to do this and took the screenshots on three separate sheets for each phone, in the presence of independent witnesses. The two mobile phones of accused Sanjeev Kumar and one mobile phone of the complainant were seized vide the memo Ex. PW7/K. Accused's Maruti Ritz car too was seized vide the same memo. DVR used for recording the conversation between accused and the complainant was kept in a brown envelope, signed, sealed with CBI seal and marked as '*DVR in RC 16(A) 2020*'. The recovery memo (Ex. PW7/K) incorporating the trap proceedings was prepared and signed by trap team members. The trap proceedings that had commenced in the

evening hours of 19.03.2020, concluded at 03:00 hours on 20.03.2020.

17. On 20.03.2020 accused agreed to voluntarily give his specimen voice. His specimen voice was recorded in a new Memory Card fitted in a new DVR the presence of an independent witness, namely, PW8 Md. Manzar Alam, Assistant Public Health Inspector, Delhi. This Memory Card was signed, sealed and marked as '*S-1 in RC No. 16(A) of 2020*'. The bottles containing the wash exhibits i.e. RHW and LHW of accused, tissue paper wash, left front seat back pocket of accused's car from which the trap money was recovered were sent to CFSL for expert opinion. The chemical examination report no. CFSL-2020/C-252 dt. 26.06.2020 (Ex. PW3/A) was received which showed positive tests for presence of phenolphthalein on all the relevant exhibits.

18. During investigation, transcription of conversation contained in Memory Cards marked Q-1, Q-2 and Q-3 were prepared from investigation copy of recorded conversation. Complainant and PW11 SI Ashwani Saroha, EOW, Mandir Marg, Delhi identified the voice of accused in the said recorded conversations. The Memory Cards marked as Q-1, Q-2, Q-3 and S-1 were sent to CFSL, New Delhi for expert opinion. In the report of Forensic Expert dt. 22.11.2021 (Ex. PW9/A) qua the voices, it was opined, "*Hence the voice marked exhibits Q-1(1)(S) to Q-1(4)(S), Q-2(1)(S), Q-2(2)(S), Q-3(1)(S) & Q-3(2)(S) are the probable voice of the person (Sh. Sanjeev Kumar) whose specimen voice is marked exhibit S-1(S).*"

19. On completion of investigation, sanction for prosecution under section 19 of the PC Act against the accused was given by Mohammad Ali, Deputy Commissioner of Police, EOW, Delhi vide his sanction order dt. 30.09.2020 [Ex. PW6/A - D-26]. CBI then filed the chargesheet against the accused on 02.11.2020.

20. Cognizance of the offence was taken and accused was summoned vide order dt. 11.11.2020. Upon his appearance on 07.01.2021, he was supplied with the copies of the chargesheet and the relied upon documents.

21. To a charge for the offence under section 7 of PC Act, framed on 02.03.2022, accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

22. In order to prove the charge against the accused, prosecution examined 17 witnesses. The prosecution witnesses are as under.

23. PW1 Amardeep Sehgal was Assistant Commissioner of Police, EOW Branch, PS Mandir Marg, Delhi at the relevant time. Prosecution called him into the witness box essentially to depose that accused Sanjeev, posted in EOW as Sub-Inspector, was later promoted to the rank of Inspector. In addition, he exhibited the transfer order dt. 01.03.2016 of accused, certified copies of attendance register dt. 17.03.2020, 18.03.2020 and 19.03.2020, certified copy of accused's salary details and details of complaints marked to him for inquiry/investigation as Ex. PW1/B (colly) - D-13. He also exhibited certified copy of the

chargesheet³ [Ex. PW1/A (colly) - D-20] of FIR no. 148/2018, PS EOW which accused Sanjeev had filed in the concerned Court pursuant to his investigation, after being forwarded by him (PW1). He also exhibited certified copies of notices dt. 06.01.2020⁴ and 15.02.2020⁵ issued by accused Sanjeev, in his capacity as a police officer, to complainant and the latter's reply dt. 08.01.2020 to the notice dt. 06.01.2020 as Ex. PW1/C – D-22.

24. PW2 Rajiv Vashisht is Nodal Officer of Bharti Airtel Limited. He entered the witness box to prove that phone number 9871870708 was in the name of accused Sanjeev. In addition, he also exhibited on record certified copy of Customer Application Form (CAF), Call Detail Records (CDR) for the period from 17.03.2020 to 19.03.2020, the certificate under section 65B of Indian Evidence Act and the Identity Proof documents of the said mobile phone number of accused as Ex. PW2/A - D-14.

25. PW3, Ms. Deepti Bhargava, is an expert witness serving

³ Notably, as per the available record the said chargesheet under section 420 of IPC was filed in January 2020 in the Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, South District, Saket Courts, Delhi. It is also noticeable that the accused therein i.e. Sanjay Gupta had been granted anticipatory bail vide order dt. 10.10.2018 passed by a Court of Session, Saket, Delhi.

⁴ Record shows that accused Sanjeev had issued this notice dt. 06.01.2020 to complainant Sanjay Gupta in the course of enquiry of complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA) of Rajeev Gupta (complainant's elder brother) alleging cheating and criminal breach of trust. Vide this notice dt. 06.01.2020, accused Sanjeev had asked complainant Sanjay Gupta to appear before him on 08.01.2020 at 12 pm to respond to the following query, "*Why did you conceal the fact of execution of MOU dated 30.12.2005 with M/s Vidhi Constructions Pvt. Ltd. from his brother Sh. Rajiv Gupta at the time of compromise dated 06.01.2006 which was submitted before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on 09.01.2006 in CS (OS) No. 1968/2003?*"

⁵ Record shows that accused Sanjeev had issued this notice dt. 15.02.2020 to complainant Sanjay Gupta in the course of enquiry of a complaint dt. 17.12.2019 (Ex. PW7/DE) of Ms. Shivani Gupta, daughter of Rajeev Gupta alleging that he (Sanjay Gupta) had committed misappropriation of L. R. Gupta (HUF) properties. Vide this notice dt. 15.02.2020, accused Sanjeev had asked complainant Sanjay Gupta to appear before him '*within five days from receipt of this notice*' in order to respond to a set of 22 questions as set out therein. However, in his letter dt. 25.08.2020 to CBI, PW5 Inspector Nitin Kumar of EOW wrote that complainant did *not* file reply to the notice dt. 15.02.2020 issued to him by the accused.

as Senior Scientific Officer-II-cum-Assistant Chemical Examiner at CFSL, Delhi. She had examined the following four washes through laboratory procedures: (i) right hand wash of the accused, (ii) left hand wash of the accused, (iii) the tissue paper wash, and (iv) wash of left front seat back pocket of accused's car from where the tainted bribe money was allegedly recovered. She gave evidence to the effect that all the above washes gave positive tests for the presence of phenolphthalein. She exhibited her Chemical Examination Report dt. 26.06.2020 as Ex. PW3/A - D-18.

26. PW4 Pawan Singh is Nodal Officer of Vodafone Idea Limited. He entered the witness box to prove that phone number 9810152142 was in complainant Sanjay Gupta's name. In addition, he exhibited on record certified copy of CAF, certificate under section 65B of Indian Evidence Act, the call details and GPRS records for the period from 17.03.2020 to 19.03.2020 as also the cell ID chart of said mobile phone number of complainant as Ex. PW4/B - D-15. He had handed over these documents to CBI vide his letter dt. 25.05.2020 which is Ex. PW4/A - D-15.

27. PW5 Inspector Nitin Kumar was posted as Inspector Administration in Section VI of EOW, Delhi Police. He is the one who, vide his letter dt. 04.08.2020 (Ex. PW1/A – D-20), had handed over to CBI certified copy of chargesheet of FIR no. 148/2018, PS EOW which accused had investigated and filed in the concerned Court. Further, vide his letter dt. 25.08.2020 [Ex. PW1/C - D-22] he had handed over the following copies to CBI,

duly certified by him : (i) notice dt. 06.01.2020⁶ issued by accused (*Sanjeev Kumar, SI, Sec-VI, EOW, Delhi*) to complainant Sanjay Gupta, (ii) complainant Sanjay Gupta's reply dt. 08.01.2020 in response to the said notice dt. 06.01.2020 issued to him by accused Sanjeev, and (iii) notice dt. 15.02.2020 issued by accused (*Sanjeev Kumar, SI, Sec-VI, EOW, Delhi*) to complainant Sanjay Gupta. In his letter dt. 25.08.2020 to CBI, this witness wrote that complainant did *not* file reply to the notice dt. 15.02.2020 issued by the accused. Further, through Production-cum-Seizure Memo dt. 19.03.2020 (Ex. PW5/A) this witness had handed over to the CBI: (i) certified copies of Rajiv Gupta's complaint dt. 31.05.2019, Rajiv Gupta's statement, complaint proforma along with the note sheet and the enclosures, and (ii) certified copies of notice dt. 03.11.2019 issued by accused to the complainant along with latter's reply dt. 28.12.2019 and the enclosures.

28. PW6 Mohammad Ali was the Deputy Commissioner of Police, EOW, Delhi at the relevant time. He had given sanction for prosecution of the accused under section 19 of the PC Act vide his sanction order dt. 30.09.2020 [Ex. PW6/A - D-26].

29. PW7 Sanjay Gupta is the complainant himself.

30. PW8 is an independent witness, namely, Md. Manzar Alam, Assistant Public Health Inspector, Municipal Corporation of Delhi. In his presence, the accused had allegedly given his

⁶ Vide this notice dt. 06.01.2020, accused Sanjeev had asked the complainant to appear before him on 08.01.2020 at 12 pm to respond to the following query, "*Why did you conceal the fact of execution of MOU dated 30.12.2005 with M/s Vidhi Constructions Pvt. Ltd. from his brother Sh. Rajiv Gupta at the time of compromise dated 06.01.2006 which was submitted before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on 09.01.2006 in CS (OS) No. 1968/2003?*"

specimen voice (S-1) on 20.03.2020. He exhibited on record the Specimen Voice Memorandum as Ex. PW8/A (D-7).

31. PW9, Mahesh Kumar Jain, entered the witness box as an expert witness serving as Senior Scientific Officer Grade II (Physics)-cum-Assistant Chemical Examiner at CFSL, Delhi. He had examined the questioned voices of the accused (Q-1⁷, Q-2⁸ and Q-3⁹) with his specimen voice (S-1) by way of auditory analysis and spectrographic analysis. By way of his report dt. 22.11.2021 (Ex. PW9/A – D-25) qua the voices, he opined, “Hence the voice marked exhibits Q-1(1)(S) to Q-1(4)(S), Q-2(1)(S), Q-2(2)(S), Q-3(1)(S) & Q-3(2)(S) are the probable voice of the person (Sh. Sanjeev Kumar) whose specimen voice is marked exhibit S-1(S).” It may be noted that this witness is a Graduate in Science and has done Certificate Course in Forensic Science from Delhi University.

32. PW10 Ramnath Meena is again an independent witness. At the relevant time, he was Superintendent in the office of Central Goods and Services Tax (CGST), EIL Building, Bhikaji Cama Place, Delhi. He was part of the verification proceedings on 17.03.2020 and 18.03.2020. He was also part of the trap proceedings conducted on 19.03.2020. He also gave evidence *vis-à-vis* preparation of the site plan, seizure of the exhibits, personal search and arrest of the accused. He also deposed that after the trap proceedings, he had once again been called¹⁰ to the

⁷ Q-1 corresponds to the verification proceedings dt. 17.03.2020.

⁸ Q-2 corresponds to the verification proceedings dt. 18.03.2020.

⁹ Q-3 corresponds to the trap proceedings dt. 19.03.2020.

¹⁰ As per the documents, it appears that he had been again called to the CBI office on 21.07.2020.

CBI office for preparation of the Voice Identification-cum-Transcription Memo (Ex. PW7/D) and the transcripts Ex. PW7/E¹¹, Ex. PW7/H¹² and Ex. PW7/I¹³.

33. PW11 is Inspector Ashwani of Delhi Police. At the relevant time, he was posted as Inspector in EOW, Delhi Police. He is a batchmate of the accused. He stated that IO had called him for voice identification. As per his evidence, audio recording was played by the IO and the voice was *probably* of the accused, but he was not sure whether the voice was of accused. He stated that the proceedings had been recorded in Voice Identification-cum-Transcription Memo Ex. PW-11/A – D-21. Before the Court, when the audio recording of the conversation of the verification proceedings dt. 17.03.2020 (Q-1) was played, he stated that out of the two voices, one voice *appears* to be of accused Sanjeev. Before the Court, when the audio recording of the conversation of the verification proceedings dt. 18.03.2020 (Q-2) was played, he stated that out of the two voices, one voice *appears* to be of accused Sanjeev. Before the Court, when the audio recording of the conversation of the trap proceedings dt. 19.03.2020 (Q-3) was played, he stated that out of the two voices, one voice *appears* to be of accused Sanjeev.

34. PW12 is Puneet Garg, an official posted in House Tax Department, Municipal Corporation of Delhi. On 24.08.2020, he had joined investigation of this case in connection with extraction of data from the two mobile phones (Redmi 4A and Samsung) of

¹¹ Transcript Ex. PW7/E relates to verification proceedings dt. 17.03.2020 (Q-1)

¹² Transcript Ex. PW7/H relates to verification proceedings dt. 18.03.2020 (Q-2).

¹³ Transcript Ex. PW7/I relates to trap proceedings conducted on 19.03.2020 (Q-3).

the accused. In this regard, he exhibited on record the Memorandum of proceedings conducted on 24.08.2020 as Ex. PW12/A - D-24.

35. PW13 Sanjeev Kumar too is an independent witness. At the relevant time, he was Junior Secretariat Assistant in Municipal Corporation of Delhi. He was part of the trap proceedings conducted on 19.03.2020.

36. PW14 is Mr. Krishna Khajaria, Assistant Programmer, System Division, CBI, Delhi. On 24.08.2020, he had joined investigation of this case in connection with extraction of data from the two mobile phones (Redmi 4A and Samsung) of the accused. In this regard, he relied upon the Memorandum of proceedings conducted on 24.08.2020 as Ex. PW12/A - D-24.

37. PW15 is Inspector Shyam Rai, who was posted in ACB-CBI Delhi at the relevant time. He was part of the verification proceedings conducted on 17.03.2020 and 18.03.2020. He was also part of the trap proceedings conducted on 19.03.2020.

38. PW16 is Inspector Bhanwar Lal Jat, who was posted in ACB-CBI Delhi at the relevant time. He is the Trap Laying Officer (TLO) of this case.

39. PW17 is Inspector Ms. Veer Jyoti of ACB-CBI. She is the Investigating Officer (IO) of this case.

40. Examined under section 313 of CrPC on 17.09.2024 the accused alleged false implication and claimed innocence. He, *inter alia*, stated, “*The complainant had lodged a false complaint against me. I had never demanded or accepted any money from*

complainant for any purpose. I have been falsely implicated in the present case as complainant was bearing grudge against me for filing charge sheet against him and arresting him in FIR bearing No. 148/18, PS EOW. Secondly, the complainant was also apprehending registration of FIR against him on the complaint of Rajeev Gupta and his daughter. To implicate me false and fabricated evidences have been created. I am innocent.”

Besides this, he stated that he had never summoned the complainant for 05.03.2020 and demanded no money from him. As regards the sanction order dt. 30.09.2020 [Ex. PW6/A – D-26], he stated that the sanction was granted *sans* application of mind and that PW6 was not competent to issue sanction order against him.

41. The accused led evidence in defence and examined four witnesses, who are as follows.

42. DW1 Rakesh Hasija, Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) and Assistant Registrar of Delhi University stepped into the witness box to prove the syllabus of the Certificate Course in Forensic Science at Anthropology Department of Delhi University as Ex. DW-1/A. It may be noted that as per this syllabus Ex. DW-1/A voice identification or auditory and spectrographic analysis is not taught in Certificate Course in Forensic Science at Anthropology Department, Delhi University.

43. DW2 Dr. Adarsh Mishra stepped in as an Expert witness from the side of the accused. He stated that the accused had engaged him to seek expert opinion whether the CFSL report qua voice identification Ex. PW9/A – D-25 was genuine or not.

In addition, he had also been engaged by the accused to opine whether accused's mobile phone no. 9871870708 was registered on WhatsApp and also whether it was possible to make a WhatsApp call without being registered on WhatsApp. In his evidence, he stated that he found various inconsistencies in the CFSL report qua voice identification Ex. PW9/A – D-25 and as such the same was objectionable. He also stated that mobile phone no. 9871870708 was not registered on WhatsApp and a WhatsApp call cannot be made without the mobile number being registered on WhatsApp. In this regard, he exhibited his report dt. 07.09.2024 (Ex. DW2/1).

44. DW3 is Rajiv Vashisht, Nodal Officer of Bharti Airtel Limited. He exhibited on record CAF and Identity Proof (Ex. DW3/A) of phone number 9871870708 registered in the name of accused Sanjeev. In addition, he also filed a certificate under section 63(4)(c) of BSA in support of CAF.

45. DW4 is Jata Shankar Mishra, who at the relevant time was SHO of PS : EOW. He entered witness box to prove the CCTV footage of the reception area of EOW of 19.03.2020 and 20.03.2020. The CCTV footage is Ex. DW4/C to Ex. DW4/G. He also exhibited the Certificate under section 65B of Indian Evidence Act as Ex. DW4/B.

46. In brief, learned PP for the CBI argued that on the basis of the oral evidence and the scientific evidence, the demand and acceptance of bribe on the part of accused stands duly proved; that there is no reason to disbelieve the version of the complainant; that all the witnesses examined by CBI have duly

supported the prosecution case; that it stands duly proved that the voices (Q-1, Q-2 and Q-3) were not tampered with; that minor discrepancies that may have crept in the prosecution evidence do not corrode the case of the CBI against the accused; that prosecution witnesses cannot be expected to have photographic memory, and that corrupt public servants should not be allowed to go scot free.

47. In brief, learned defence counsel argued that complainant had an enmity with the accused and as such his version cannot be accepted as the gospel truth without sufficient corroboration; that there is no material on record to corroborate the version of the complainant; that in any event the prosecution has failed to establish demand and acceptance of bribe on the part of accused; that the sanction to prosecute the accused is defective, firstly because the sanctioning authority was not competent to grant the sanction and secondly, because he had not applied his mind to the important question of grant of sanction to prosecute; that PW9 Mahesh Kumar Jain's very competence to depose as an expert is doubtful; that the evidence of defence to show that after the alleged trap of 19.03.2020, almost the entire proceedings were conducted in the office of EOW; that the witnesses of the prosecution have given conflicting evidence on several other aspects like, recovery of the alleged tainted money, the site plan etc.

48. Arguments heard. Record perused.

49. To begin with, I find from the record that complainant Sanjay Gupta is an individual who has been involved in

numerous judicial proceedings, as well as various inquiries/investigations undertaken by the police. The matters pertaining to him, as documented in the present record, are enumerated below.

(i) In FIR no. 122/18 PS Barakhamba Road under sections 354C/376D/506 of IPC, complainant Sanjay Gupta was an accused.¹⁴

(ii) In FIR no. 214/2020 dt. 14.12.2020 PS EOW under sections 420/466/ 467/468/471/120B of IPC (Ex. PW7/DA), registered at the instance of one Ranvir Tyagi, complainant Sanjay Gupta was an accused.¹⁵

(iii) In FIR no. 148/18 PS EOW under section 420 of IPC, complainant Sanjay Gupta was an accused. Going by complainant's allegations, it is in the investigation of this case that accused had demanded Rs. 10 lacs from him.

(iv) In police complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA) of Rajeev Gupta addressed to DCP (EOW), Delhi, complainant Sanjay Gupta was subjected to police enquiry. This very police complaint, which Sanjay Gupta in his representation dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) to the CBI claims was '*strangely*' assigned to accused Sanjeev for investigation, is also the complaint in relation to which he alleges that accused had demanded money to investigate in his favour.

(v) In her police complaint dt. 17.12.2019 (Ex. PW7/DE) Ms. Shivani Gupta (Rajeev Gupta's daughter) alleged that

¹⁴ Complainant Sanjay Gupta (PW7) admits this in his cross-examination. However, his explanation is that it was got registered by a black mailer.

¹⁵ Complainant Sanjay Gupta (PW7) admits this in his cross-examination.

Sanjay Gupta had committed misappropriation of properties of L. R. Gupta (HUF). In this matter, complainant Sanjay Gupta was subjected to a police enquiry conducted by accused Sanjeev himself. It is in relation to this enquiry that accused had issued notice dt. 15.02.2020 to complainant to appear before him within five days.

(vi) Complainant Sanjay Gupta had filed a complaint case along with an application under section 156 (3), CrPC against Rajiv Gupta.¹⁶

(vii) Rajiv Gupta had filed a complaint case against Sanjay Gupta in the Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.¹⁷

(viii) Complainant Sanjay Gupta had moved an application under section 340 of CrPC (Ex. PW7/DC) against Rajiv Gupta in the complaint case filed by the latter as mentioned in the preceding sub-paragraph.¹⁸

(ix) Complainant filed *two* separate complaint cases in Court, one against Ranvir Tyagi and another against SHO PS Barakhamba Road.¹⁹

(x) Complainant Sanjay Gupta had been involved in a civil suit bearing CS (OS) no. 1968/03 titled '*Rajiv Gupta v. L. R. Gupta, HUF & Ors.*' before Hon'ble Delhi High Court as defendant no.3.²⁰

¹⁶ Complainant Sanjay Gupta (PW7) admits this in his cross-examination dt. 20.02.2023.

¹⁷ This case is CC no. 18293/2019 filed on 25.10.2019.

¹⁸ Copy of the application under section 340, CrPC is on record (D-19).

¹⁹ Complainant (PW7) makes an admission qua this in his cross-examination dt. 20.02.2023.

²⁰ Copy of the plaint, the order dt. 09.01.2006, and the application dt. 06.01.2006

(xi) Complainant Sanjay Gupta was also been involved in a civil suit titled '*Smt. Sumangli Gupta @ Sumangli Jain v. Shri L. R. Gupta, HUF & Ors.*' before Hon'ble Delhi High Court as defendant no.3.²¹

(xii) Complainant Sanjay Gupta is also involved in CS (OS) No. 1965/12 titled '*Ms. Sonakshi Gupta v. Shri L. R. Gupta, HUF & Ors.*' before Hon'ble Delhi High Court as defendant no.3.²²

(xiii) In RFA no. 85/1987, complainant Sanjay Gupta was respondent no.3.²³

(xiv) In SLP No. 6137/15 titled '*Sanjay Gupta v. Rajiv Gupta and Anr.*' before the Apex Court, complainant was the petitioner.²⁴

50. The point therefore is that complainant Sanjay Gupta is an individual who is neither unfamiliar with nor inexperienced in legal processes, whether before the courts or the police. The available court record clearly reflects that he has been engaged in multiple litigations spanning several years, with documented involvement in legal proceedings dating back to at least 1987, if not even earlier. His background therefore reveals a long and an active association with the justice system. But this observation is certainly not to cast aspersions on his credibility or to suggest

filed under Order XXIII Rule 3 read with Section 151 of CPC in this civil suit are on record (D-19). The suit pertained to reliefs of partition, rendition of accounts, and injunction.

²¹ According to the records available on the website of the Delhi High Court, this civil suit is CS (OS) 255/2011. Copy of plaint of this civil suit is on record (D-19).

²² Copy of the plaint of this civil suit is on record (D-19). This is a suit for partition, rendition of accounts and injunction.

²³ Copies of few papers out of this litigation are on record (D-19).

²⁴ Copy of order dt. 05.03.2018 of the Apex Court is on record (D-19).

that his testimony must necessarily be viewed with distrust. Every litigant, irrespective of past involvement in legal matters, is entitled to have his evidence considered fairly and on its own merits. However, this longstanding familiarity with litigation is a relevant and significant circumstance that cannot be overlooked. It necessarily calls for a careful evaluation of his evidence. Given his numerous litigations, including the several criminal cases/ FIRs that he has faced as an accused, over the last several years, his evidence is required to be scrutinised carefully.

51. In the above backdrop, an analysis of complainant Sanjay Gupta's complaint dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) made to the CBI is necessary. Complainant alleges, *inter alia*, that accused Sanjeev, who was the IO of FIR no. 148/18 PS EOW, had demanded bribe of Rs. 10 lacs from him during the investigation around Diwali festival of year 2018, and upon his refusal to so pay he *recently*²⁵ chargesheeted him. However, there are few things to be noted on this score. Firstly, except for his own self-serving *ipse dixit*, there is nothing on record to substantiate complainant's averment about bribery demand of Rs. 10 lacs around Diwali festival in 2018. Secondly, it is noticeable that complainant made no complaint with any authority *vis-à-vis* his allegation of demand of Rs. 10 lacs by accused around 2018 Diwali festival. There is no contemporaneous evidence in the form of any communication with anyone, much less any complaint to police or any other authority, to suggest that accused had sought Rs. 10 lacs as bribe from him during 2018

²⁵ As per the information available on e-court services mobile App, the chargesheet was filed on 29.01.2020.

Diwali festival. Complainant came up with this allegation for the first time in the form of his complaint dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) to CBI, approximately 16-17 months after the alleged bribery demand of Rs. 10 lacs. Thirdly, this allegation is vague in multiple respects. It fails to specify the exact date, time, or location of the alleged bribery demand, and it does not indicate whether the demand was made over the phone, in person, or through an intermediary. And the complainant (PW7) has persisted with this vagueness in his oral evidence as well. Fourthly, complainant Sanjay Gupta had already been admitted to anticipatory bail in the said FIR vide order dt. 10.10.2018 passed by a Court of Session, Saket, Delhi. And as such, in the said FIR accused Sanjeev was in *no* position to hold the threat of his arrest as a leverage to intimidate or scare him. Fifthly, the complainant asserts that accused Sanjeev chargesheeted him because he refused to pay him bribe of Rs. 10 lacs. However, in my view, it is highly speculative to conclude that the chargesheet was filed solely due to his non-payment of the purported bribe of Rs. 10 lacs. If this allegation is accepted at face value, the implication would be that accused Sanjeev proceeded to file the chargesheet even though there was no prosecutable material against Sanjay Gupta in FIR no. 148/18, PS EOW. But, I doubt if any such inference can reasonably be drawn from the material available on record. The chargesheet was not filed unilaterally by accused Sanjeev; rather as per the record it had been duly forwarded and vetted by two police officers senior to accused Sanjeev, namely, Inspector Rajneesh Kumar and ACP Amar Deep Sehgal (PW1). In these circumstances, it would be

untenable to contend that accused Sanjeev proceeded to file the chargesheet in the absence of prosecutable material for the reason that complainant did not pay him the demanded bribe of Rs. 10 lacs. Apart from this, once the chargesheet was filed before the Court, it was duly examined, and following the preliminary judicial procedures prescribed under the CrPC, the Court proceeded to advance the case to the stage of framing of charge.²⁶ Reaching the stage of consideration on the point of framing of charge implies that Court had taken cognizance of the offence(s) under section 190 of CrPC. This also implies that Court had likely issued summons to Sanjay Gupta (PW7) under section 204 CrPC. The factum of taking cognizance of an offence under section 190 of CrPC very much implies that the Court had *applied its mind* to the material before it. The factum of crossing the stage of issuance of process under section 204 of CrPC implies that the Court had found ‘*sufficient ground for proceeding*’ in the matter against Sanjay Gupta (PW7). Given all this, I do not accept complainant’s stand that chargesheet in FIR no. 148/18 PS EOW had no prosecutable material against him and that the same had been filed by accused Sanjeev malafidely only and only because he had not been paid the alleged bribe of Rs.10 lacs. To accept such a stand would in effect amount to doubting the bonafides and casting aspersions on the conduct of two senior police officers, namely, Inspector Rajneesh Kumar and ACP Amar Deep Sehgal (PW1) as also the Court which had taken *cognizance* of the offence(s) under section 190 of CrPC

²⁶ The ordersheets of FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW, as available on the e-court services mobile App, show that the matter had reached the stage of consideration on the point of framing of charge.

and likely issued summons to Sanjay Gupta (PW7) under section 204 of CrPC. Sixthly and more importantly, it is proved on record that accused Sanjeev had shown no favour to Sanjay Gupta (PW7) in investigation of FIR no. 148/18, PS EOW. Complainant Sanjay Gupta (PW7) himself admits this when he states in his cross-examination, *“It is correct that no favour was given or shown by the accused in the charge sheet case of FIR No. 148/2018.”* Given all this, I am inclined to view with grave doubt this allegation of complainant Sanjay Gupta that during investigation of FIR No. 148/18 PS EOW accused Sanjeev had demanded bribe of Rs. 10 lacs from him around Diwali festival of year 2018, and upon his refusal to so pay he proceeded to file chargesheet against him.

52. Aside from the above, there is one more aspect that is to be noted in respect of investigation of FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW by the accused. Complainant alleges in his complaint Ex. PW7/A, *“During the investigation in the above said matter, without any rhyme or reason, SI Sanjeev Kumar summoned my elder brother Mr Rajiv Gupta who has been on loggerheads with me and my father since 1997.”* However, this allegation against the accused appears to be baseless and completely frivolous, and the evidence of PW1 suffices to reach such a conclusion. PW1 ACP Amardeep Sehgal in his cross-examination has deposed, *“I have gone through the charge-sheet of case FIR no. 148/18 PS EOW, when forwarded by me for putting in court for trial which is already part of Ex. PW1/A (Colly). It is correct that as per charge-sheet one money trail of the cheated amount was mentioned in it and as per item no. 1 of page 14 of the said*

charge-sheet, it was mentioned that a sum of Rs.3.5 crores were paid to Sh. Rajeev Gupta in the said amount out of the cheated amount. It is correct that in case money trail shows transfer of money to various persons, it is justified for the IO of the case to call those persons for interrogation and for seeking clarification regarding money so received by them from the cheated amount.”

53. Now to the incident of 05th March 2020. Complainant Sanjay Gupta in his complaint Ex. PW7/A next alleges that on 05.03.2020 accused Sanjeev had demanded Rs. 30 lacs in total to investigate his brother Rajiv Gupta's complaint²⁷ in his favour; that Rs. 30 lacs also included Rs. 10 lacs which accused had demanded while investigating FIR no. 148/2018. This allegation of the complainant concerning 05th March 2020 remains unproved and, moreover, appears highly doubtful. Apart from complainant's own self-serving *ipse dixit*, there is nothing on record to support this assertion. Even his own statement, however, is far from free of blemishes. Complainant (PW7) in his oral evidence asserts that accused Sanjeev had issued notice to him to appear before him on 05.03.2020. In this regard, in his cross-examination dt. 20.02.2023 he deposes, “*As far as I recollect, I received notice from the accused to appear before him on 05.03.2020. I did not show copy of this notice to CBI as it was not demanded. I can search said notice in my office files and can produce the same on next date of hearing. It is incorrect to suggest that no such notice was ever sent to me by the accused*

²⁷ EOW Complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA) of Rajiv Gupta. In addition, Rajiv Gupta had also instituted a complaint case bearing CC no. 18293/2019 against Sanjay Gupta on 25.10.2019 in the Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.

for appearance before him on 05.03.2020.” However, no such notice of 05.03.2020 purportedly issued to him by accused Sanjeev ever saw the light of the day. This was despite the fact that complainant Sanjay Gupta had been granted an opportunity on 20.02.2023 to bring such notice on court record. But when he next entered the witness box on 19.04.2023, he (PW7) deposed, “I have not brought the notice received by me from the accused for appearance before him on 05.03.2020 and representation dt. 26.08.2020. (Vol. I did not remember whether any notice was received by me from accused for appearance on 05.03.2020. I forgot to bring the representation dt. 26.08.2020). It is incorrect to suggest that no notice was sent by the accused for my appearance before him on 05.03.2020. It is wrong to suggest that I did not meet the accused at any point of time from 05.03.2020.”

54. Next, the tone and tenor of the oral evidence of the complainant (PW7) is to the effect that accused Sanjeev had issued notice to him to appear before him on 05.03.2020 and during the course of such meeting he had made the alleged bribery demand of Rs. 30 lacs to investigate the complaint²⁸ of his brother Rajiv Gupta in his favour and which included Rs. 10 lacs which he had allegedly demanded while investigating FIR no. 148/2018. As already stated hereinabove, complainant failed to furnish the said written notice of 05.03.2020 on court record. Here it is noticeable that even the record furnished by Economic Offences Wing (EOW) of Delhi Police qua the said complaint of

²⁸ EOW Complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA) of Rajiv Gupta. In addition, Rajiv Gupta had also instituted a complaint case bearing CC no. 18293/2019 against Sanjay Gupta on 25.10.2019 in the Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.

complainant's brother Rajiv Gupta nowhere discloses that any such notice had been issued by accused Sanjeev to complainant asking him to appear before him on 05.03.2020. That apart, there is no other document or any other form of evidence to suggest that complainant was indeed present in the EOW office of Delhi Police in order to meet the accused on 05.03.2020. It may be mentioned here that at least in connection with FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW there could arise no question of accused issuing notice to complainant for 05.03.2020 inasmuch as its chargesheet had already been filed in the Court in January 2020.

55. Furthermore, the record furnished by Economic Offences Wing (EOW) of Delhi Police shows that accused Sanjeev in fact, on receipt of Rajiv Gupta's complaint dt. 31.05.2019, vide his office note dt. 06.06.2019 (Ex. PW1/DB) had himself requested his senior officers to treat the same as a '*fresh one and to give it a separate number.*' Accused Sanjeev Kumar in his office note dt. 06.06.2019 (Ex. PW1/DB) had very much written that '*Cause of Actions of FIR No. 148/18 PS EOW and Rajiv Gupta's complaint were different.*' Thus, right at the very beginning, accused Sanjeev had sought to disassociate himself from the inquiry/ investigation of Rajiv Gupta's complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA). This is an extremely important circumstance favoring the accused. This significant circumstance indicates that accused Sanjeev had, perhaps, demonstrated no real or sustained *personal* interest in pursuing Rajiv Gupta's complaint against Sanjay Gupta — the matter in connection with which he is alleged to have demanded a bribe. This point is also crucial because the allegation is that the accused demanded Rs. 10 lacs

from Sanjay Gupta way back around Diwali festival in 2018. And, if the accused truly had a *personal* interest in Sanjay Gupta's affairs, he would not have attempted to distance himself from the inquiry into Rajiv Gupta's complaint against him after having raised the bribery demand in 2018 Diwali festival. It is also to be noted that despite this observation of accused in the office notings, the said complaint of Rajiv Gupta ultimately came to be re-marked to him by his senior officers for inquiry/investigation and this is quite evident from written text of EOW office notings that are available on court record. However, once specific directions were issued by his superior officer(s) and Rajiv Gupta's complaint was re-marked to him, accused Sanjeev had little choice but to make the requisite enquiries /investigation into the said complaint against Sanjay Gupta. In such circumstances, compliance was not a matter of discretion but of duty.

56. Furthermore, it is also noticeable that in connection with the inquiry into Rajiv Gupta's complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA), accused had issued notice to complainant for his appearance before him on 08.01.2020 at 12 pm. Complainant had duly complied with the said notice and had submitted his written response dt. 08.01.2020. It is also to be noted that Rajiv Gupta had also filed a complaint case in the Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi²⁹ and wherein the ATR (Action Taken Report) was required to be filed by 05.12.2019.³⁰ But, it is unclear from the judicial record

²⁹ This case is CC no. 18293/2019 titled '*Rajiv Gupta v. Sanjay Gupta*' instituted on 25.10.2019.

³⁰ Office notings of Economic Offence Wing (EOW) of Delhi Police show that the

whether or not accused Sanjeev could file the ATR in the said Court. However, qua accused's other notice dt. 15.02.2020³¹ asking the complainant to appear before him within five days to answer to 22 queries, complainant gave *no* response whatsoever. In his letter dt. 25.08.2020 to CBI, PW5 Inspector Nitin Kumar of Delhi Police writes that complainant Sanjay Gupta did *not* file any reply to accused's notice dt. 15.02.2020. CBI has, however, filed on record a letter dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/P) purportedly written by complainant to '*SI Sanjeev Kumar*' thereby '*seeking time of one week to collect the entire information*', apparently in response to accused's notice dt. 15.02.2020 raising 22 queries. However, the impression that I get is that in all likelihood the complainant had *not* furnished this letter dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/P) to accused Sanjeev for the following reasons: (a) Complainant submitted the original letter dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/P) to CBI in response to CBI notice dt. 24.08.2020 issued to him. Given this, it is not possible that the very same original letter would be at two places simultaneously, i.e. with the accused in EOW office of Delhi Police, and with the complainant, and which he later submitted to CBI. (b) This letter does not form part of the official record of Delhi Police EOW. It was rather filed by CBI on Court record after the complainant had furnished the same to CBI. (c) It bears repetition to state that in his letter dt. 25.08.2020 PW5 Inspector Nitin Kumar writes to

Action Taken Report (ATR) was to be filed in the Court on 05.12.2019.

³¹ This notice dt. 15.02.2020 issued to complainant Sanjay Gupta by accused was apparently in relation to enquiry into the complaint dt. 17.12.2019 (Ex. PW7/DE) of Ms. Shivani Gupta, daughter of Rajeev Gupta alleging that he (Sanjay Gupta) had committed misappropriation of L. R. Gupta (HUF) properties. Vide this notice dt. 15.02.2020, accused Sanjeev had asked complainant Sanjay Gupta to appear before him '*within five days from receipt of this notice*' in order to respond to a set of 22 questions as set out therein.

CBI that complainant Sanjay Gupta filed *no* reply to accused's notice dt. 15.02.2020.

57. It appears to me that in all likelihood this response dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/P) of the complainant purportedly addressed to '*SI Sanjeev Kumar*' was drafted and signed much later and then submitted to CBI along with complainant's covering letter dt. 27.08.2020 (Ex. PW7/M).

58. It is noteworthy that on 17.03.2020 complainant (PW7) lodged his complaint (Ex. PW7/A) with the CBI alleging a demand for bribe; yet, on that very same day, his *purported* response dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/P), addressed to '*SI Sanjeev Kumar*', conveniently requests '*a week's time to collect the entire information.*' This juxtaposition of the events is quite striking.

59. Next, after the alleged bribery demand of 05.03.2020, complainant made no complaint with any authority. He came up with such a complaint 12 days later on 17.03.2020. When asked about this in his cross-examination, he stated, "*It is correct that as per my complaint Ex. PW7/A, the demand was made on 05.03.2020. I did not file any complaint between 05.03.2020 to 17.03.2020 as I was afraid of lodging a complaint against a police officer under the fear of future enmity with the police officials. (Vol. I am a businessman and engaged in property business. I lodged the complaint after 12 days after discussing with my family members, friends and lawyer and my lawyer suggested me that if I did not make any complaint, the police officials will arrest me.)*" The explanations offered for the 12-day

delay in lodging the complaint dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) regarding the alleged demand for bribe are difficult to digest. This lack of credibility stems from quite a few compelling reasons, each of which not only undermines the plausibility of complainant's explanation but also casts a shadow over the integrity of his overall conduct. Firstly, accused Sanjeev was in *no* position at all to arrest the complainant. He certainly could not have arrested him in FIR no. 148/18 PS EOW, for its chargesheet had already been filed in the Court in January 2020 and the complainant had been admitted to anticipatory bail therein way back on 10.01.2018. Neither could the accused have arrested the complainant in the pending police complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA) of Rajiv Gupta, *sans* it being converted into FIR disclosing cognizable and non-bailable offences. And for that matter, the accused could not have arrested the complainant even in the matter of Rajiv Gupta's court complaint case that was *sub judice* in Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi³² and wherein the ATR (Action Taken Report) was to be filed by 05.12.2019; he could not have done so, i.e. arrested the complainant, without a specific order of the Court that was seized of the complaint case. The other explanation that his lawyer had advised him on the legal implications of his potential arrest by the accused is equally difficult to fathom. Considering the facts that stare in the face, it is hardly conceivable that any lawyer of even moderate competence would offer such advice, particularly to an individual who is himself a seasoned veteran in litigations. This

³² This case is CC no. 18293/2019 filed on 25.10.2019.

explanation, therefore, strains credulity and undermines the reliability of complainant's account. The next explanation that he feared inviting future enmity with accused, a police officer, is plainly a mere facade and lacks any persuasive force. I categorically reject it and refuse to give it even the slightest credence. If it is indeed true that he feared inviting enmity with the accused, a police officer, it becomes difficult to comprehend as to how he could have instituted a court complaint case against the then SHO of PS Barakhamba Road, Delhi. Was he not concerned about provoking the ire of the SHO? This glaring inconsistency severely undermines the credibility of his claimed apprehension. Further, as already observed herein, the complainant is no ordinary litigant. He is neither unfamiliar with nor inexperienced in legal processes, whether before the courts or the police. He has been engaged in multiple litigations spanning several years, with documented involvement in legal proceedings dating back to at least 1987, if not even earlier.

60. On 05.03.2020 accused Sanjeev, as per the complaint Ex. PW7/A, had demanded Rs. 30 lacs, which included Rs. 10 lacs in connection with FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW. The chargesheet of FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW has already been filed in January 2020 and complainant Sanjay Gupta had already been admitted to anticipatory bail therein vide order dt. 10.10.2018 passed by a Court of Session, Saket, Delhi. Complainant himself states in his evidence that the accused '*without showing any favour*' to him had chargesheeted him in FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW. Therefore, the accused certainly had no official capacity as on 05.03.2020 to show any favour or disfavour to the complainant in connection

with FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW after having already filed the chargesheet. Further, the amount of Rs. 10 lacs qua the said FIR also cannot be said to be any *reward* to the accused for the reason that the accused had acted contrary to the interests of the complainant by chargesheeting him and ‘*without showing any favour*’ to him. Given his considerable experience in litigation, the complainant would certainly have known this.

61. In connection with Rajiv Gupta’s complaint, accused summoned the complainant through official notices, which is one of the complainant’s grievances. However, the evidence and the material on record reflects that accused Sanjeev had acted by the book and with no malafide motive in issuing the notices to complainant Sanjay Gupta. Accused Sanjeev had very much taken permission of his senior officer(s) in issuing notice(s) to the complainant; and this stands proved through the evidence of PW1 ACP Amardeep Sehgal, who in his cross-examination has deposed, “*It is correct that after preliminary enquiry, accused while acting as inquiry officer sought approval from the Senior officer for calling suspect Sanjay Gupta for logical inquiry in that matter, vide note sheet Ex. PW1/DF. The said recommendation was forwarded by me vide my endorsement at point X on Ex. PW1/DF which bears my signature at point X1. The said approval was accorded by the competent authority through proper channel.*”

62. The crux of the foregoing discussion concerning the alleged demand for a bribe on 5th March 2020 is that prosecution has failed to prove it. The sole piece of evidence on this aspect,

i.e. the alleged demand made on 05.03.2020, is the testimony of the complainant (PW7) himself; yet even that is riddled with multiple, insurmountable inconsistencies and gaps that fatally undermine its reliability. Several explanations offered by the complainant (PW7) in an attempt to bridge the gaps in his narration of the crucial incident of 05.03.2020 are wholly implausible and strain credulity. The law is well settled by the judgments of Apex Court in Panna Damodar Rathi v. State of Maharashtra, (1979) SCC 526 and Ayyasami v. State of Tamil Nadu, (1992) 1 SCC 304 whereby it has been clarified that the sole testimony of the complainant, who is the interested witness, cannot be relied upon without having corroboration with the independent evidence.

63. Based on detailed examination of the facts and the evidence adduced thus far, I am now inclined to draw a very significant inference, namely, that complainant Sanjay Gupta harboured a deep-seated grudge against accused Sanjeev Kumar. A careful analysis of the facts and evidence has revealed several curious circumstances, which inevitably compel this Court to arrive at such a crucial conclusion. His conduct, the numerous shortcomings in his narrative, and the motivations underlying his actions all point toward a personal animus that seems to have shaped his approach to the entire episode. The motivations driving complainant Sanjay Gupta (PW7) were manifold, and the factors that led him to nurture a deep-seated animosity towards accused Sanjeev were equally numerous. To begin with, the accused '*without showing any favour*' to him had chargesheeted him in FIR no. 148/2018 PS EOW. Further, the accused as part

of his official duty had been inquiring into the police complaint dt. 31.05.2019 (Ex. PW1/DA) of Rajeev Gupta against him (complainant). Qua this police complaint, the accused, as it appears from the record, had issued two notices to him (complainant), the first being notice dt. 03.11.2019 asking him to appear before him on 04.11.2019 at 12 pm, and the second being the notice dt. 06.01.2020 thereby asking him to appear before him on 08.01.2020 at 12 pm. It bears repetition to state that he (complainant/PW7) had actually filed his reply dt. 08.01.2020 in response to the notice dt. 06.01.2020 issued to him by accused Sanjeev. As already discussed hereinabove, accused had issued the notices to the complainant after taking permission of his senior officers. In other words, he had *no* malafide intent in issuing the notices to complainant. Furthermore, Rajiv Gupta had also instituted a Court complaint in the Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi³³ and wherein the ATR (Action Taken Report) was required to be filed by 05.12.2019 by the accused.³⁴ But, it is unclear from the judicial record whether or not accused Sanjeev could file the ATR in the said Court. In order to file the ATR in the Court, it is but obvious that the accused, being the police officer, as part of his official duty, was required to make inquiries from the concerned persons, including Sanjay Gupta (PW7). Lastly, there was another police complaint dt. 17.12.2019 (Ex. PW7/DE) of Shivani Gupta (Rajeev Gupta's daughter) against complainant Sanjay Gupta, which too was being inquired into by the accused

³³ This case is CC no. 18293/2019 filed on 25.10.2019.

³⁴ As per office notings of Economic Offence Wing (EOW) of Delhi Police, the Action Taken Report (ATR) was to be filed in the Court on 05.12.2019.

in his capacity as a police officer. It bears repetition to state that accused Sanjeev had issued notice dt. 15.02.2020 to complainant Sanjay in the course of his enquiry into this complaint Ex. PW7/DE of Ms. Shivani Gupta, wherein it was alleged that he (Sanjay Gupta) had committed misappropriation of L. R. Gupta (HUF) properties. Vide his notice dt. 15.02.2020 accused had asked complainant Sanjay Gupta to appear before him ‘*within five days from receipt of this notice*’ in order to respond to a set of 22 questions as set out therein. It has already been concluded hereinabove that the complainant had filed *no* reply to notice dt. 15.02.2020 issued to him by accused Sanjeev. Instead, he opted to lodge a complaint dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) with the CBI alleging that accused was demanding bribe from him. All these criminal cases and complaints against the complainant, which the accused was examining/investigating or had examined/investigated in his capacity as a police officer with ‘*no favour being shown*’ to him were sufficient to create a sense of growing unease, strain and antagonism in complainant’s mind toward the accused. It was these accumulating sentiments and motivations that most likely ultimately impelled the complainant to proceed against the accused by lodging his complaint dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/A) before the CBI.

64. The next crucial episode in the sequence took place on 17.03.2020, when CBI conducted the first verification exercise. It is CBI’s own case that the verification exercise of 17.03.2020 yielded *no* demand of money/bribe on the part of accused. In the Verification Memo dt. 17.03.2020 (Ex. PW7/B) CBI itself writes, “*The verification is kept open for tomorrow i.e. 18.03.2020 as*

the demand on the part of SO [Suspect Officer] could not be verified.” That apart, the complainant (PW7) candidly acknowledges in his oral deposition that on 17.03.2020 there was no discussion whatsoever concerning money between him and accused Sanjeev. In this regard, the relevant extracts of his (PW7) cross-examination are as follows :

Cross-examination dt. 20.02.2023

I left CBI office finally at about 08:00 PM on 17.03.2020. It is correct that no money talks had taken place during any conversation with accused on 17.03.2020.

Q: I put to you that verification dated 17.03.2020 was conducted by CBI officer to bring evidence of demand of money from suspect officer on record?

Ans: It is correct.

I cannot admit or deny the suggestion that verification dated 17.03.2020 was unsuccessful.

Cross-examination dt. 19.04.2023

It is correct that no money talks had taken place between me and the accused during any alleged telephonic conversation on 17.03.2020. (Vol. There were talks about meeting only).

Que: I put it to you that verification dt. 17.03.2020 was unsuccessful as no evidence of demand of bribe came on record?

Ans: It is correct.

65. In this context, the testimonies of PW10 Ramnath Meena (independent witness) and PW15 Inspector Shyam Rai also assume significance. Both witnesses participated in the verification exercise conducted on 17.03.2020. During his cross-examination on 08.11.2023, PW10 stated, *“It is correct that no money talks took place in the telephonic conversation between complainant and the suspect officer on 17.03.2020.”* Similarly, in his cross-examination on 05.02.2024, PW15 deposed, *“It is correct that no money talks took place on 17.03.2020.”*

66. Thus, it is evident from the above, and which is also the case of the CBI, that accused had raised no demand for any illegal gratification on 17.03.2020. And, this brings me to another point. If, as the complainant (PW7) alleges, the accused had already demanded Rs. 30 lacs on 05.03.2020, it is unusual that in their conversation on 17.03.2020 the latter did not make even a passing reference to this alleged demand. The complainant, knowing the conversation would later serve as evidence, would have been extremely cautious and guarded in what he said; the accused, unaware of this, certainly would not have been. In these circumstances, the absence of any mention on accused's part in the conversation on 17.03.2020 about Rs. 30 lacs demand appears particularly striking.

67. Now to the events of 18.03.2020 when a further verification exercise was carried out. It is CBI's case that in the verification exercise conducted on 18.03.2020 the accused in his conversation with complainant (PW7), duly recorded in Memory Card (Q-2), had demanded bribe from the latter. To establish the same, the prosecution has invoked multiple strands of evidence, each deserving of scrutiny in turn.

68. The first evidence on this count is that of PW15 Inspector Shyam Rai. This witness, though part of the verification team, admittedly had not accompanied the complainant and the independent witness PW10 Ramnath Meena to meet the accused on 18.03.2020. Consequently, he can proffer no evidence of his own as to what exactly had transpired in the meeting/conversation between the two of them in the verification

exercise conducted on 18.03.2020.

69. The next evidence on this score is the oral deposition of PW10 Ramnath Meena, an independent witness of the verification proceedings. As per PW15 Inspector Shyam Rai's oral testimony, this *'witness was instructed to accompany the complainant and overhear the likely conversation to be held between the complainant and the accused.'* The oral testimony of PW10 Ramnath Meena, however, provides no support to the prosecution case. PW10 Ramnath Meena in his oral evidence concedes that he had not heard the conversation between accused and the complainant that took place on 18.03.2020. In his examination-in-chief dt. 02.08.2023, he stated, "*The complainant went near the building gate and stood outside the gate. He was visible to me from the place where I was standing and he made a phone call. Thereafter, somebody came near to the complainant who was wearing a mask. His face was not visible due to mask. They talked to each other for 5 about minutes but it was not audible to me. Thereafter, Sanjay Gupta came outside the building.*" Thus, PW10 Ramnath Meena's oral evidence does not at all suffice to prove that on 18.03.2020 accused Sanjeev had made any demand for illegal gratification from the complainant.

70. The next is the deposition of a very crucial witness, namely, PW9 Mahesh Kumar Jain who entered the witness box as a scientific expert. He was the one who had forensically examined the conversations between the accused and the complainant as contained in the Memory Cards (Q-1³⁵, Q-2³⁶, Q-

³⁵ Q-1 corresponds to the verification proceedings dt. 17.03.2020.

³⁶ Q-2 corresponds to the verification proceedings dt. 18.03.2020.

3³⁷) and compared the same with accused's sample voice as contained in a Memory Card (S-1). In his Forensic Report dt. 22.11.2021 (Ex. PW9/A) qua the voices, PW9 opined, "*Hence the voice marked exhibits Q-1(1)(S) to Q-1(4)(S), Q-2(1)(S), Q-2(2)(S), Q-3(1)(S) & Q-3(2)(S) are the probable voice of the person (Sh. Sanjeev Kumar) whose specimen voice is marked exhibit S-1(S).*" Learned defence counsel during the course of arguments with considerable vehemence had attacked his deposition on the ground that he was no scientific '*expert*' in the field of voice identification and/or auditory and spectrographic analysis. I am inclined to accept this argument of the defence. PW9 Mahesh Kumar Jain is a graduate in Science. In 1996, he completed a certificate course in Forensic Science at Department of Anthropology, Delhi University. It is clear from the evidence on record that PW9 Mahesh Kumar Jain had *not* learnt the science of voice identification and/or auditory and spectrographic analysis either in his graduation or in the certificate course in Forensic Science. In his cross-examination, he conceded that voice identification was not a subject in his graduation degree. However, to this, he added that '*sound*' was one of the subjects taught in graduation. It may be noted that '*sound*' as a subject in physics/ science in graduation is quite distinct and different in its scope and content from '*voice identification and/or auditory and spectrographic analysis*' as a subject in forensic science. Next, even in the certificate course of Forensic Science which PW9 had studied in Anthropology Department of Delhi University, voice identification and/or auditory and spectrographic analysis was

³⁷ Q-3 corresponds to the trap proceedings dt. 19.03.2020.

not taught. Syllabus³⁸ (Mark PW9/DX) of the certificate course in Forensic Science at Department of Anthropology, Delhi University was put to PW9 and he was asked whether ‘*voice identification*’ had been taught to him. Notwithstanding this, PW9 Mahesh Kumar Jain denied the suggestion that voice identification had not been taught to him in the certificate course. However, DW1 Rakesh Hasija, an official from Delhi University entered the witness box to prove the said syllabus and which he exhibited on record as Ex. DW1/A. The syllabus Ex. DW1/A : Mark PW9/DX clearly shows that voice identification and/or auditory and spectrographic analysis was *not* taught in certificate course in Forensic Science in Anthropology Department, Delhi University.

71. It is pertinent to mention here that the said syllabus (Mark PW9/DX : Ex. DW1/A) of the certificate course in Forensic Science at Anthropology Department, Delhi University had been obtained by accused Sanjeev under Right to Information Act, 2005 (RTI) which are Mark PW9/DX : Ex DW1/B. Learned Public Prosecutor took objection to the mode and the manner of proving the syllabus Ex.DW1/A on the ground that witness DW1 Rakesh Hasija was not its author. This argument cannot be accepted. Syllabus Ex. DW1/A, though obtained under the RTI, does not cease to be of any value for the purpose of evidence merely because DW1 Rakesh Hasija was not its author. DW1 Rakesh Hasija is an official of Delhi University. He in his evidence has only owned up the said syllabus Ex.DW1/A as being that of the certificate course in Forensic

³⁸

Accused Sanjeev obtained this syllabus under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

Science in Anthropology Department, Delhi University. The syllabus Ex.DW1/A does not at its foot disclose any author. It does not at its foot mention as to who had prepared it. This is a document of Delhi University and as such it was fit and appropriate on the part of DW1 Rakesh Hasija to come and own up that it was a syllabus of certificate course in Forensic Science in Anthropology Department, Delhi University. Furthermore, there could perhaps have been no single mind in preparing the syllabus Ex. DW1/A. It would have been most likely a team work of several individuals. And as such, without the document (Ex. DW1/A) disclosing the minds who had prepared it, it would have been a difficult exercise to bring any one of them to the witness box. To repeat, it was sufficient that DW1 Rakesh Hasija, an official of Delhi University, stepped into the witness box to own up and prove that the said syllabus Ex. DW1/A of certificate course in Forensic Science in Anthropology Department, Delhi University.

72. Aside from the above, PW9 Mahesh Kumar Jain stated in his evidence, *“During my service tenure, I have assisted in the examination of more than 600 cases and I have myself examined 100 cases and have given my report on the same in the field of Voice Spectrography.”* However, no details of such cases were furnished on record. It is significant to note that PW9 in his evidence has conceded that till date he has not given any *negative* report qua voice identification where examination was sought qua only one person. The Privy Council, in United States Shipping Board v. Ship “St. Albans”, AIR 1931 PC 189 held, *“The opinion of scientific men upon proven facts may be given*

by men of science within their own science. The witness must have made a special study of the subject or acquired a special experience therein. That is, he must be skilled and have adequate knowledge of the subject.” Considering that PW9 lacks any study, let alone specialised study, in voice identification and that his experience in this scientific discipline is not convincingly proved, his status as an ‘*expert*’ on the subject is questionable.

73. This leaves us with two other evidences, namely that of Inspector Ashwani (PW11) and complainant (PW7). PW11 Inspector Ashwani is a batchmate of the accused and he was called to the witness box to identify the voice of the accused. Before the Court, when the audio recording of the conversation of the verification proceedings dt. 18.03.2020 (Q-2) was played, he stated that out of the two voices, one voice *appears* to be of accused Sanjeev. Thus, oral evidence of PW11 Inspector Ashwani does not suffice to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the voice in the conversation of the verification proceedings dt. 18.03.2020 (Q-2) was definitely that of the accused.

74. This leaves us with the evidence of complainant insofar as the verification exercise of 18.03.2020 is concerned. On this count, the complainant (PW7) in his oral evidence before the Court stated as follows, “*Before going to the office of accused, I was instructed by the CBI officers that until and unless there is a demand from the side of accused, they will not take any action against him. CBI officers also gave the DVR in CBI office which was kept in my blazer. The DVR was switched on just before reaching the office of EOW when I alighted from the car. The*

accused came out from the building and I told him that Rs. 30 Lacs is a big amount and I cannot afford to give Rs. 30 Lacs. I requested him to take some lesser amount but he refused to take less than Rs. 30 Lacs. Accused stated that he cannot reduce the amount but he can take this amount in installments in one or two years time. I told the accused that I will come to his office on the next day and will make the part payment. I also told the accused to prepare the report in my favour before his transfer and he agreed to it.”

75. Thus, the only evidence which can possibly link the accused with the alleged demand of bribe in the verification exercise of 18.03.2020 is that of the complainant. However, for the elaborate reasons as set out hereinabove, I am not inclined to accept his testimony all by its own without any corroboration in material particulars from other sources. It bears repetition to state that complainant was propelled by his own objectives in seeking to lure the accused into incriminating circumstances, fuelled by a clear personal hostility toward him. This court is reluctant to accept complainant’s evidence all by its own without any corroborating circumstances. There is no evidence on record to corroborate complainant’s version on the point of alleged demand of bribe by the accused in the verification exercise on 18.03.2020.

76. Even assuming for the sake of arguments that the transcript (Ex.PW7/H) and the audio recordings of 18.03.2020 (Q-2), reflect a correct picture of what had transpired on 18.03.2020, yet I find that the accused himself never initiated the

talks *vis-a-vis* the money. Going by the transcript and the audio recording it is quite evident that it was the complainant himself who initiated the talks qua giving and taking of money. For ready reference, the relevant extract of the transcript of the conversation between accused and the complainant that took place on 18.03.2020 is as follows:

Complainant (C)	अच्छा मेरी सुन लो ये है लंबा
Accused (A)	ठीक है
C	आपको इसको पास इसमें 80 85 90 परसेंट इसमें अभी कर लिया है काम वो कह रहा है कि वो कह रहा है इसलिए मैं अर्ज कर रहा हूँ ये अभी फटाफट करा है न जल्दी जल्दी में
A	लिखेगा
C	वो भी लिखेगा इसमें अभी 2-4 कमियां है मेरी अर्ज मेरी ये अर्ज है इसको आज भर दो ऊपर भिजवा आगे आप इसको ऊपर भिजवा दो आप कहोगे अगर कल मैं कल आ जाता हूँ ठीक है और फरदर आप जो भी टाइम दोगे मैं आऊंगा इस हिसाब से 20 कर दो न सुन तो लो कोरोना वायरस के चक्कर में लॉकडाउन
A	कोई नहीं
C	सुन तो लो सर थोड़े कम कर दो प्लीज़ कम
A	दो मिनट दो मिनट रुक जाओ
C	इसको आप
A	हां हां लेता हूँ
	09:03 10:22 मिली जुली आवाजें
	10:22 13:17
C	ये मास्क क्या सबको कहा है पहनने के लिए
A	हां ये डिपार्टमेंट की तरफ से है
C	ये डिपार्टमेंट ने दिए है पर आपको सारा दिन पहन के तो तबीयत खराब हो जाती है टीवी में आ रहा है
A	हां लेकिन सारा दिन नहीं पहनते है ऑक्सीजन की कमी तो हो ही जाती है
C	ऑक्सीजन की फिर अपना ही ----- तो बड़ी दिक्कत है
A	चलो हम तो झेल लेंगे हमारे से दूसरे को तो न लगे
C	मैं भी ये कर के रखा हूँ

A	हां हां ये ठीक है ---- बढ़िया है
C	अभी मेरी आपसे न मैं आपका ज्यादा टाइम नहीं लूंगा
A	सुनो सुनो उससे कम मत करो दो बार मे कर दो तीन बार में कर दो चार बार में कर दो
C	मैं कर दूंगा प्लीज कम कर दो प्लीज कम कर दो
A	अरे इतने बड़े आदमी हो अच्छा नहीं
C	पता है क्यों असली बात सुनो फिर पेमेंट कल होगी
A	आप उसकी बात मत करो सुनो मेरी बात सुनो आप उसकी बात मत करो चाहे आप एक साल में दो
C	अरे नहीं नहीं नहीं ऐसा मत कहो मुझे आप से से जल्दी जल्दी रिपोर्ट लिखानी है आप अंडर ट्रांसफर हो जाओगे -----
A	हां
C	गवर्नमेंट का कुछ पता नहीं
A	इसीलिए इसीलिए मैं कह रहा हूं मैं अपनी तरफ से तो काम कर जाऊं
C	सुनो
A	आपकी तरफ से मुझे कोई टेंशन नहीं है
C	चलो मुझे पता है आपको मेरे उपर पूरा विश्वास है
A	आपकी तरफ से कोई टेंशन नहीं
C	मुझे पता है जो मैं आपको कमिट कर जाऊंगा आपको दूंगा मेरी ये अर्ज है आप मेरे प्लीज कम कर दो कोरोना वायरस के चक्कर में
A	कोई बात नहीं कोरोना वायरस साला एक साल में खत्म हो जाएगा क्यों टेंशन ले रहे हो आप
C	अरे सर
A	आप मेरी तरफ से फी रखना
C	बीस कर दो चलो 20 कर दो
A	अब आप ज्यादा आवाज मत करो
C	चलो आवाज, आहिस्ता बोल देता हूं ठीक है
A	सुनो एक तो हाथ में दे दो इस बात की टेंशन मत लो कि आपको दो दिन में चार दिन में पांच दिन में जितने दिन में हूं आपका रिप्लाइ बना के जाऊंगा आप उसकी टेंशन न लो
C	हां
A	आप एक साल में दो साल में, पांच साल में, दस साल में
C	अरे दस साल -- छू लिया सर छू लिया सर
A	आप उस बात की टेंशन मत लो

C	कम कर दो ---- थोडा कम कर दो
A	मुझ से क्यूलग रहा है कि कही ऐसा न हो ट्रांसफर दो चार दिन में आ जाए तो बेक डेट में ही आपका रिप्लाइ लो करके----बेक डेट में बना के बेक डेट में ही सैक्शन निकलवा दूंगा
C	बहुत बढ़िया
A	बेक डेट में तुरंत निकलवाएं----थोडा---उस उसमें -----
C	छोटी सी रिक्वेस्ट है मान लो कसम खिलवा लो किसी की भी पेमेंट बिल्कुल नहीं आ रही है सुनो सुनो मैं आपको चिटियां दिखाऊंगा
A	वो मैं कह रहा हूं आपको मुझे बताओ वो मैं कह रहा हूं आपको
C	30 से थोडा कम कर दो
A	मैं कह रहा हूं आपको
C	आप कह रहे हो दस साल में दे देना कुछ तो कम कर दो
A	मत देना मत देना
C	ऐसा करो 30 से कुछ कम कर दो
A	अच्छा बाद में कर देंगे, ठीक है
C	कर दोगें न
A	टेंशन मत लो
C	ठीक है राइट सर थैंक्यू थैंक्यू
	13:17 13:45 मिली जुली आवाजें
	13:45.....
C	एक मिनट संजीव जी एक मिनट आप से एक अर्ज है क्योंकि आपसे ज्यादा जल्दी मुझे हो रही है
A	मैं कर लूंगा आज ही कर दूंगा
C	तो मैं कल आऊ क्या
A	आ जाना कल आ जाना
C	पैसे अच्छे कुछ पैसे अच्छे
A	आप बोला मत करो बस
C	ठीक है ठीक है ओ के ओ के

77. The above conversation clearly shows that it was the complainant who had actually initiated the talks about money. If it is the case of prosecution that the dealings that were taking

place between accused and the complainant on 18.03.2020, as recorded in the Memory Card (Q-2), were in continuation of the alleged demand made by the accused on 05.03.2020, then I must observe that the prosecution has faltered on this count. This is because it is already been held hereinabove that prosecution has failed to prove the alleged demand for a bribe on 5th March 2020. It is thus to be taken that complainant was the one who was initiator for the talks regarding giving and taking of bribes. He was the one who was prompting the accused towards the talks about money / bribe. Complainant is tempting and provoking the accused to do something wrong. This is apparently contrary to the norms for trapping people in corruption cases. Complainant contradicts himself when he states in his evidence that prior to the verification proceedings on 18.03.2020, he was under instructions by the CBI that the demand for the bribe must be from the side of accused. In this regard, he deposed in his examination-in-chief, *“Before going to the office of the accused, I was instructed by the CBI officers that until and unless there is a demand from the side of the accused, they would not take any action against him.”* Conversely, if it is the case of the prosecution that the dealings that took place on 18.03.2020 were not in continuation of the alleged demand made on 05.03.2020 then the moot question to be asked is as to why in the first place the accused directed and guided the conversation towards payment of bribe.

78. In Shridhar Chavan v. The State of Maharashtra, 2015 SCC OnLine Bom 5057 it was observed as under:

36. In *Som Prakash v. State of Delhi*, AIR 1974 SC 989, Their Lordships referred to laying of traps as a 'morally murky mechanism', and observed:

“..... Courts have frowned upon evidence procured by such experiments since the participants are prone to be over-anxious and under-accrulous and the victims are caught morally unawares”.

37. Yet, laying of traps has been held to be justified as inevitable for detecting a crime, and to collect evidence against a dishonest public servant. However, the Courts have also recognized that traps could be laid in different circumstances, and by different types of complainants. In the same case, it was observed:

“Where you intercept the natural course of the corrupt stream by setting an invisible contraption its ethics is above board. On the contrary, to test the moral fire of an officer whose reputation is suspect, if you lay a crime mine which explodes when he, in a weak moment, walks on it the whole scheme is tainted”.

38. The pronouncements of the High Courts and Supreme Court have classified the traps into 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate'. Illegitimate traps are viewed with disapproval by the Courts. Illegitimate traps are those which arise when a public servant is deliberately tempted to accept a bribe/illegal gratification by offering to him such bribe or gratification though he never went out of his way to make any such demand. It must be understood clearly that the provisions of the P.C. Act are not designed for ascertaining whether a public servant is honest or not. Traps cannot be laid for deciding the general honesty and integrity of a public servant. Traps cannot be organized for observing whether a public servant, if offered money can be lured into doing something which he otherwise, would not have done. In *Ramjanam Singh v. The State of Bihar*, AIR 1956 SC 643 it was observed as follows:-

“Whatever the criminal tendencies of a man may be, he has a right to expect that he will not be deliberately tempted beyond the powers of his frail endurance and provoked into breaking the Law; and more particularly by those who are guardians and keepers of the law”.

39. In the said case, the reference as ‘guardians and keepers of the law’ was to the police, but the said observations are extremely relevant in the present case also where the complainant is an Advocate - treated as an Officer of the Court - and the appellant is an employee - a public servant working on the establishment of the High Court; and the question is whether the complainant had tempted and provoked the appellant - a Chobdar - to do something wrong for a monetary gain.

40. Judicial Pronouncements have also recognized that there are various types of complainants. The one whose complaint is not valid or justifiable, and is not in compliance with the established or accepted rules and standards, is believed to be, often having ulterior intentions in levelling corruption charges against a public servant. Courts have taken great caution in ascertaining the nature and type of the complainant, in deciding whether an accused is guilty in a given case. The one who mischievously sets bait to one or more public servants and then, traps them after they have acted on the luring of such complainant, is recognized as a ‘fishing complainant’. Such traps are deprecated as practically amounting to the abetment of an offence, and artificially creating a crime. In such cases, it would be the duty of the Court to properly scrutinize the evidence of the complainant to ascertain the validity/reliability of his claims and to unmask his ulterior intentions. The appreciation of the evidence of the complainant in a trap case, is required to be done be keeping in mind the type of the complainant.

79. There is another aspect which is quite striking in this conversation of 18.03.2020 between accused and the complainant. At no point in the conversation the accused ever demanded or even requested the complainant to come the following day (19.03.2020) with any money, much less any amount of Rs.4 lacs.

80. The next and the last important date in the sequence of the events is 19.03.2020. The trap proceedings were conducted on 19.03.2020 in the compound of EOW. As per prosecution

case, on 19.03.2020 complainant along with two independent witnesses (PW10 Ramnath Meena and PW13 Sanjeev Kumar) and the CBI team went to lay a trap on the accused. It was in this trap that complainant allegedly gave Rs. 4 lacs to the accused as bribe. PW10 Ramnath Meena as per his own evidence did not go inside the EOW office. In his examination-in-chief he himself stated that he remained standing at the gate of EOW office boundary, whilst two CBI officials and public witness Sanjeev Kumar (PW13) went inside EOW office. PW13 Sanjeev Kumar in his examination in chief, *“The complainant went inside the building. After some time, the complainant was seen coming outside the building while taking to a person.”* PW13 Sanjeev Kumar on the point of identification deposed that he *may be the person* who was the accused. PW15 Inspector Shyam Rai in his evidence does not say that alleged conversation between the complainant and the accused on 19.03.2020 and the actual giving and taking of money that day took place in his presence. PW16 Inspector Bhanwar Lal Jat too, as per his own evidence, was not a direct witness to the alleged conversation between the complainant and the accused on 19.03.2020 and the actual giving and taking of money that day. This makes the complainant (PW7) the only witness to prove the actual incident of the demand and acceptance of bribe by the accused on 19.03.2020. Now, the complainant is a person who has a deep personal animus against the accused. His intent to manoeuvre the accused into a situation involving the alleged bribe is evident. Given this, this Court has to tread very cautiously into accepting his evidence on the incident of 19.03.2020. In his examination-in-

chief, the complainant (PW7) states, “*Accused came downstairs and I told him that I had brought some money to be given to him. On which accused said koi baat nahin le lenge. On this, I told the accused that jab main le aaya hun to aap le lijiye, main kahan rakhunga apne pass kyunki mere father ghar par cash rakhna allow nahin karte. On this the accused, told me le leta hun. Thereafter, the accused took me towards the back side of the complex, near the residential quarters of EOW, where I handed over the said envelope to the accused.*” However, this does not present a complete account of the incident of the actual trap of 19.03.2020 as described by PW7 in his examination-in-chief, when considered alongside the transcript (Ex. PW7/I) of the conversation recorded on Memory Card (Q-3) between the two individuals. A careful reading of the conversation captured on the Memory Card (Q-3) makes it abundantly clear that the accused consistently displays unwillingness to accept any money from the complainant. Throughout the exchange, as per the transcript (Ex. PW7/I), accused neither solicits nor encourages any financial favour. In stark contrast, the complainant, as per the transcript (Ex. PW7/I), repeatedly attempts to press the money upon him, making deliberate efforts to persuade the accused to take it despite his evident reluctance. The overall tenor of the conversation of 19.03.2020 between them suggests not a voluntary acceptance on the part of the accused, but rather a persistent attempt by the complainant to impose the money on him, thereby creating circumstances that could be construed adversely against the accused. For ready reference, the relevant extract of the conversation of 19.03.2020 between accused and

the complainant, as culled out from the transcript Ex. PW7/I is as follows:

Complainant (C)	सर नमस्कार मुबारक हो
Accused (A)	सर एक सैकण्ड रुक जाओ जरा सा । मैं आपको प्रोटेक्ट करना चाह रहा हूं । नहीं नहीं वो मत करो वो भी किसलिए करना है लो मैंने तो प्रोटेक्ट कर लिया
C	आं --- हां जय हो जय हां
A	चाय पीछे मिल सकती है, गुप्ता जी मैंने उसको पढ़ तो लिया
C	मैं एक अर्ज करूँ आप इसको आज पढ़ लो
A	मैं इसको आज घर ले जाऊंगा
C	आज पढ़ लो
A	आज पढ़ लेता हूँ आराम से
C	मैं कल दुबारा आ जाऊंगा
A	अब सुनो मेरी बात सुनो मैं फोन पर ही बता दूंगा अगर उसमें कुछ होगा ।
C	एक और अर्ज है दूसरी अर्ज । एक टाइपड पेज, मैं नहीं चाहता आप अपने हाथ से लिखो । मुझे लिख । मुझे समझ तो आयेगी नहीं सच्ची बताउं लम्बा पंगा है आप टाइप बना दो पेपर पे मैं संचित से मंगा लूंगा
A	मैं देख लूँ एक बार लिखा क्या है
C	ऐसा है मैं ना इसके अनुसार अच्छा लाऊंगा
A	नहीं वो रहने दो सुनो रहने दो नहीं नहीं रहने दो
C	सुनो वो 4 लाख लाया हूँ आज
A	सुनो अभी रहने दो ना महाराज सुनो मैं भी बात सुन लो मेरे अंदर क्या है मैं बता देता हूँ । मेरे दिल में क्या है पहले वो सुन लो आप । मेरे दिल में ये है कि मैं बैंक में पड़े है । आपको टेंशन लेने की जरूरत नहीं है । टेंशन लेने की जरूरत मुझे होनी चाहिए
C	क्यूँ
A	आप कभी मत लो टेंशन
C	मैं तो ---
C	मुझे जरूरत पड़ेगी अरजेंसी में जरूरत पड़ेगी तो मेरा द्रांसफर आ जायेगा और मुझे कोई यहां से भगा देगा । नोट ओनली द्रांसफर आ जायेगा । द्रांसफर आने के बाद भी कम से कम एक डे महीना लगेगा । तब तक नहीं चला आया मैं तो अमरजेंसी में जरूरत पड़ेगी । नहीं तो मैं करता रहूंगा

C	सर, एक काम करो ना लेके छुट्टी करो । मैं कहां रूखूं। मैं केश नहीं रखता घर में सच कह रहा हूँ मैं कसम से कह रहा मैं केश रखता ही नहीं हूं घर में ना ही आफिस में । लेके छुट्टी करो, मेरी टेंशन एमाउंट कम होता जाये, टेंशन क्यों बढ़ा रहे हो । केश में बिल्कुल नहीं रखता मेरे तो फादर ने कह रखा ह
A	सर, मैं दो मिनट में आया । फादर से बातचीत होती है आपकी
C	बहुत कम होती है
A	समझ पाते हैं
C	बहुत कम समझ पाते हैं। मेरे फादर ने हमेशा ये ही समझाया है कि घर में कभी केश नहीं रखना । पहले तो केश के अगेंस्ट होते थे, केश में कोई डील मत किया करो । लेंड में सारा चक्कर होता है केश ही लेना पड़ता है। बिकती नहीं लेंड तो बड़ी मुश्किल से, इसलिए मैं ना कम से कम केश लेता हूं और वो भी कही ना कही कोशिश करता हूं कि कोई ले जाये साला कोई ले जाये, वापिस भी ना करें मुझे बड़ा डर लगता है। फादर ने कह रखा है पहले से कि तुम यार ये काम मत किया करो, टेंशन खत्म करो
A	मैं तो सोच रहा था कि---
C	सर कोरोना वायरस के चक्कर में ना bank खाली हो रहे हैं देख लिया ना yes बैंक का क्या हुआ। हां हां हां जो मिल जाये वो अच्छा है
A	आपका तो नहीं था ये
C	ना ना, भगवान ने बचा लिया । भगवान की बड़ी कृपा है मेरे उपर भगवान की बड़ी कृपा है आपकी कृपा से। मेरे एक दोस्त काथा डेड करोड रूप्या यैस बैंक में, खास दोस्त का
A	यैस बैंक में
C	यैस बैंक में खास दोस्त का उसने कहा यार मैं फंस गया। सुनने में आ ही गया था कि गर्वनर ने कह दिया है। मैंने सीधा फोन किया कि यार सुनने में आ रहा है कि तुम्हारा पैसा मिल जायेगा
A	हां, पैसा आ ही जायेगा । गर्वमेंट इतने बड़े पैसे को कैसे जाने देगी
C	नहीं नहीं गर्वमेंट की क्या इज्जत रह जायेगी पब्लिक में। मेरा वकालत से कोई लेना देना नहीं है वो सॉरी सर, सॉरी सर । अच्छा
A	हां हां
C	सर मैंने आपको चार लाख रुपये दिये
A	हां, कोई नहीं

81. Assuming for the sake of arguments that the aforesaid conversation presents a true account of the conversation between accused and the complainant on the day of trap i.e. 19.03.2020 and the other voice is that of the accused, though the defence vehemently refutes it, yet there are a couple of things that are very-very striking. At no point in the conversation of 19.03.2020 did the accused ever demand any money. On the contrary, the above conversation shows that complainant informs the accused that he has brought Rs. 4 lacs and insists upon him to take the same but the latter is reluctant. As reflected in the conversation dt. 19.03.2020 (transcript Ex. PW7/I), the accused consistently reiterates that he does not wish to accept any money. The complainant, however, persistently attempts to persuade him, offering a multitude of justifications for why the accused ought to take the sum of Rs. 4 lacs on that very day. The tenor of the exchange reveals that it is the complainant who is actively urging the accused to alter his stance and accept the money, rather than any indication of a voluntary or willing acceptance on the part of the accused. Put differently, while the accused repeatedly declines the offer of money, the complainant persistently insists that he should accept it. The conversation (transcript Ex. PW7/I) thereafter ends with the complainant saying, “*Sir, Maine 4 lac rupay de diye hai.*” Now this does not actually reflect as to how and in what manner the cash of Rs. 4 lacs came into accused’s possession. It remains uncertain whether the complainant, acting deliberately and in disregard of accused’s express unwillingness, forcibly placed the money into accused’s hands or slipped it into his pocket. The circumstances, as they emerge from the record,

leave open the possibility that complainant took affirmative steps to impose the money upon the accused contrary to his will, rather than the accused voluntarily accepting it. Thus, it is also not clear as to how and in what manner the accused after his initial protestations and reluctance turned around to have the money in his possession. We do not have the video recording of the said event of 19.03.2020 when the cash of Rs. 4 lacs allegedly changed hands from the complainant to the accused. It is only the video recording that could have made things clear as to how and in exactly what manner, the cash amount of Rs. 4 lacs allegedly happened to change hands from the complainant to that of the accused. I refuse to construe this as demand and acceptance of illegal gratification on the part the accused. It is the complainant himself who is deliberately and with sinister designs goading the accused into taking money, despite his protestations. The manner in which the complainant presses the issue, offering reasons, urging compliance, and attempting to create a sense of inevitability around acceptance of the money strongly suggests a calculated effort on his part to induce the accused into an incriminating act. This sustained and purposeful insistence underscores that the complainant's conduct was driven by a design to deliberately entangle the accused despite latter's persistent refusal.

82. In Suraj Mal v. State, (1979) 4 SCC 725 it has been held that mere recovery of tainted money, divorced from the circumstances under which it is paid is not sufficient to convict the accused when the substantive evidence of the case is unreliable.

83. In Soundarajan v. State, (2023) 16 SCC 141 and Jai Narayan v. State, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 5513 it has been held that in order to attract section 7 of the PC Act, the demand of gratification has to be established beyond reasonable doubt. Such is not the case here.

84. In State of Kerala and Another v. C.P. Rao, (2011) 6 SCC 450 it has been held that prosecution has to prove the charge beyond reasonable doubt like any other criminal offence.

85. In State of Maharashtra v. Dnyaneshwar Laxman Rao Wankhede, (2009) 15 SCC 200, it has been held that the prosecution must prove the foundational facts in order to raise the presumption of section 20 of PC Act against the accused. In the case at hand, the prosecution has failed to prove the foundational facts in this regard. It has failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt the demand and/or the acceptance of illegal gratification on the part of the accused.

86. Besides the above, there are many other inconsistencies in the prosecution case. To cite just one, on the point of recovery of tainted money, the witnesses are at variance. PW7 in his evidence could not tell the place where the money was found inside the car. PW10 Ramnath Meena stated that PW13 Sanjeev Kumar took out the tainted money from the front seat back side pocket of the co-passenger. However, PW13 Sanjeev Kumar at one place in his evidence stated that envelope containing the tainted money was recovered from the rear side of the car. However, at another place in his evidence, he (PW13) stated, "*It is correct that I did not recover any envelope containing*

currency notes from the rear side of the car.”

87. On behalf of accused Sanjeev Kumar, an issue as regards the sanction under section 19 of PC Act had been raised. It was raised on two counts, firstly on the issue of competence of the sanctioning authority (PW6) and secondly on the issue of application of mind. PW6 was the DCP of EOW, Delhi Police. He was the one who had given the sanction to prosecute. He deposed that he being the competent authority to remove Sub-Inspectors had given the sanction to prosecute against accused who was of Sub-Inspector rank vide his sanction order Ex. PW6/A. It was contended on behalf of the accused that the accused was promoted to the post of Inspector and as such PW6 could not have given the sanction order. However, the promotion granted to the accused was not a regular promotion but it was *a looking after charge of Inspector* and this is quite apparent from the office order dt. 13.03.2020 of Delhi Police. The office order dt. 13.03.2020 clearly directs that accused will not claim any benefit such as seniority, pay and allowances and the date of regular promotion to the post of Inspector and it would neither affect any *inter se* seniority; that the said arrangement can be discontinued at any time without assigning any reason. Given this, I do not think that the accused can claim parity with the officers of Inspector rank of Delhi Police. It has come in the evidence of PW6 that he was the competent officer to remove officers of the rank of Sub-Inspector. Given this, it is my view that PW6 was competent to grant the sanction. On the point of non-application of mind, learned counsel for the accused had argued that PW6 has conceded in his evidence that he did not

peruse the report of the physics division of CFSL. I doubt if on this point alone, the accused can say that failure of justice has been caused to him (see in this regard the judgment of CBI v. Jagat Ram, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3675).

88. Conclusion : In the light of the foregoing discussion, I am of the considered view that prosecution case is shrouded with serious infirmities, discrepancies and contradictions. CBI has miserably failed to bring any cogent and clinching evidence so as to record the finding of guilt against the accused of the alleged offence. The essential ingredients of ‘demand’, ‘acceptance’ and ‘motive or reward’ for the purpose of section 7 PC Act has remained unproved and as a consequence, prosecution miserably failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt against the accused. As a consequence, accused Sanjeev Kumar is acquitted in this case.

Announced in the open Court
today i.e. 08.12.2025

M. P. Singh
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-02
RACC/New Delhi/08.12.2025