

**CBI/91/2024**  
**CNR No. DLCT11-000549-2024**  
**FIR No. RC 2162021A0003**  
**CBI vs. Pradeep Kumar Mishra and Anr.**

**14.11.2025**

**(Present proceedings have been conducted on Hybrid Mode)**

Present: Sh. Raj Kamal, Ld. PP for CBI.

**A-1** Pradeep Kumar Mishra and **A-2** Preeti Mishra @  
Priti Mishra on bail, through VC.

Mr. Shri Singh and Ms. Surabhi Vaya, Ld. Counsels for  
**A-1** and **A-2**.

1. Cost of Rs. 101/- stands deposited with DSLSA by the  
accused persons in terms of order dt. 04.11.2025. Bank receipt dt.  
13.11.2025 is filed on record.

2. Part arguments on charge of Ld. Defence counsels  
heard. Ld. Counsel Mr. Shri Singh points out that A-1 had  
purchased a Bolero vehicle from BSF Canteen on 23.02.2013 for  
approximately Rs. 5.66 lacs and which was later sold out during  
the check period for Rs. 3.60 lacs; attention in this regard is  
invited to statement of the purchaser LW-58 Mr. Vikram Kumar  
Mishra. The document evidencing purchase of the Bolero vehicle  
is D-95. It is his submission that the IO has not accounted for  
this Bolero vehicle in his calculation. It is next his submission  
that A-2 (wife of A-1), is a working woman and A-1 cannot be  
charged for a case of Disproportionate Assets for the failure of A-  
2 to truly declare her income. Ld. Counsel Mr. Shri Singh invites  
attention to order dt. 04.03.2025 whereunder the CBI filed a fresh  
chart for calculation of Disproportionate Assets in respect of the

two accused. As per the said chart, it is pointed out, A-1 Pradeep Kumar Mishra's Disproportionate Assets is to the tune of about 15% and that of A-2 is to the tune of about 168%. Ld. Defence Counsel thus submits that if the Bolero vehicle is accounted for, the Disproportionate Assets of A-1 will be about 6.62% only. Ld. Counsel Mr. Shri Singh further invites attention to order dt.. 29.05.2025 and submits that the CBI has resorted to double counting in respect of few expenses by adding the actual expenses along with presumptive 1/3rd expenses. Ld. Counsel Mr. Shri Singh in support of his argument relies on a judgment dt. 08.09.2015 in Phoolchand Gupta v. State of MP, Criminal Appeal 1906/2009 to contend that there is no settled principle of law that the presumptive expense would amount to 30%.

3. Arguments of the defence on the point of charge shall continue on the next date of hearing. Ld. Counsel Mr. Shri Singh seeks liberty to file updated list of income/expenses/assets of the check period highlighting the differences with the corresponding list of the CBI.

4. List on 21.11.2025.

(M. P. Singh)  
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-02  
RACC/New Delhi/14.11.2025