

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

11.12.2025

(Present proceedings have been conducted on Hybrid Mode)

Present: Sh. Raj Kamal, Ld. PP for CBI, physically present.
A-1 Sachin Chauhan, **A-2** Kuldeep, **A-3** Vikram Mishra, **A-4** Amit Kumar, **A-5** Dipu Kumar, **A-6** Sanjay @ Sanjay Kadian and 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, physically present.
Sh. Keshav Sharma, Ld. Legal Aid Counsel for **A-3** Vikram Mishra, physically present.
Ms. Arya Pathak, Ld. Proxy Counsel for **A-4** Amit Kumar, through VC.
Sh. Siddharth Kumar, Ld. Proxy Counsel for **A-5** Dipu Kumar, through VC.
Sh. Sahil Nindawat, Proxy Counsel for **A-6** Sanjay @ Sanjay Kadian, physically present.
Sh. S. S. Ahluwalia and Sh. Nishant Varun, Ld. Counsels for **A-7** M/s Sify Technologies, physically present.

1. On 01.11.2025, Ld. PP for CBI, in the light of order dt. 25.10.2025, had filed an application for submission of additional documents along with a bunch of documents (D-53, D-54, D-55, and D-56), a list of additional witness as well as a statement dt. 19.12.2018 under section 161 of CrPC of Mr. Amit Goel.

2. As regards this application, Senior Counsel/Counsels for A-1, A-3, A-5 and A-7 have already given their no objection. They have already taken the stand that they have no objection if the said application of the CBI is allowed.

3. Today on behalf of **A-2** Kuldeep his counsel Sh. Nitish Gupta states that he has no objection if the said application of the CBI is allowed. Likewise, on behalf of **A-4** Amit Kumar his proxy counsel Ms. Arya Pathak states that she too has no objection if the said application of the CBI is allowed. Similarly, on behalf of **A-6** Sanjay @ Sanjay Kadian, his proxy counsel Sh. Sahil Nindawat too states that he has no objection if the said application of the CBI is allowed.

4. In view of the above, the aforesaid application of the CBI is hereby allowed.

5. Part arguments in rebuttal of Ld. PP for CBI heard. Ld. PP for CBI submits that under section 13 (1) (d) (iii) of PC Act, there is no requirement of there being any *quid pro quo*. In this regard, he relies on a judgment dt. 21.12.2011 in Runu Ghosh v. CBI, 2011 SCC OnLine Del 5501. It is further his contention that A-7 M/s Sify Technologies was discharging a '*public duty*' as defined under section 2 (b) of the PC Act.

6. List for further arguments in rebuttal on behalf of CBI on **13.01.2026 at 10:30 am.**

(M. P. Singh)
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-02
RACC/New Delhi/11.12.2025