

CC No. 31/2022
CNR no. DLCT11-000266-2022
RC No. 09(A)/2018/CBI/AC-1/ND
CBI v. Sachin Chauhan & Ors.

25.10.2025

(Present proceedings have been conducted on Hybrid Mode)

Present: Sh. V. K. Ojha, Ld. Substitute Senior PP for CBI,
physically present.
Sh. Neel Mani, Ld. Substitute PP for CBI, physically
present.
A-1 Sachin Chauhan, **A-2** Kuldeep, **A-3** Vikram
Mishra, **A-4** Amit Kumar, **A-5** Dipu Kumar and **A-6**
Sanjay @ Sanjay Kadian, through VC.
Sh. S. Athmanandha Perumal, AR of **A-7** M/s Sify
Technologies, through VC.
Sh. Aditya Sachdeva, Ld. Counsel for **A-1** Sachin
Chauhan, through VC.
Sh. Nitish Gupta, Ld. Counsel for **A-2** Kuldeep,
through VC.
Sh. Keshav Sharma, Ld. Legal Aid Counsel for **A-3**
Vikram Mishra, physically present.
Ld. counsel Sh. Devesh Chauhan for **A-4** Amit Kumar,
through VC
Ms. Summi Singh, Proxy Counsel for **A-6** Sanjay @
Sanjay Kadian, through VC.
Senior Advocate Sh. Siddharth Aggarwal along with
Sh. Pawan Sharma, Sh. S. S. Ahluwalia, Sh. Abhishek
Chauhan and Sh. Nishant Varun, Ld. Counsels for
A-7 M/s Sify Technologies, physically present.

1. At the very outset, DLSA counsel Sh. Keshav Sharma
for **A-3** points out that in the order dt. 18.10.2025 there is a
typographical error in the second paragraph. He invites Court's
attention to the following extract of order dt. 18.10.2025, "*...that
in the unrelayed upon documents there is one document which is
stated to have been recovered from the possession of A-3 Vikram
Mishra; that the said document is actually a judicial order of year*

2013 and which has no bearing whatsoever on the present matter and that from the facts and circumstances of the case no irresistible conclusion about guilt of A-3 can be drawn.” He submits that he is not sure whether the said document of year 2013 is a judicial order. He submits that in any event that said document, which is part of unrelied upon documents, is not relevant for this case.

2. Arguments on charge on behalf of A-7 M/s Sify Technologies by Senior Advocate Sh. Siddharth Aggarwal partly heard. During the course of arguments, Senior Advocate Sh. Siddharth Aggarwal submits that in this matter the following foundational documents are not on record: (i) SSC complaint dt. 04.03.2018 made to the CBI, (ii) the FIR, or its copy, (iii) the FSL reports which are at serial nos. 274 and 275 of the unrelied upon documents, (iv) Request for Proposal (RFP) and the agreement between SSC and Ms/ Sify Technologies, and (v) Preliminary Enquiry (PE) report. Senior Advocate Sh. Siddharth Aggarwal further submits that CBI ought to clarify its position with regard to these documents and then he would carry forward his arguments on the point of charge.

3. IO/Inspector Animesh Kumar be called for the next date of hearing. Arguments to continue on **01.11.2025 at 02:00 pm.**

(M. P. Singh)
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-02
RADC/New Delhi/25.10.2025