

**CBI Vs. Tarun Kumar Malik**

**RC No. 2182024A0007**

**U/s 7 PC Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018)**

**CBI/47/2025**

**19.03.2026**

Present: Mr. Satish Garg, Ld. Sr. PP for CBI.  
IO Jaskaran, PI, CBI, AC-III is also present.  
Accused Tarun Malik is present on bail (through VC).  
Sh. Aditya Wadhwa and Sh. Raunaq Bali, Ld.  
Counsels for the accused.  
Witness R.Ravi is present (through VC).

Witnesses Sh. Harish Kumar and Sh. Varun Singh Chauhan are also present.

PW-8 Sh. Varun Singh Chauhan recalled for cross examination. He has been cross examined and discharged.

At this stage, IO has filed an application for taking on record the original complaint on the ground that original was inadvertently not filed but its photocopy was already on record. Ld. Counsel for the accused objects to the same stating that prosecution was trying to fill up the lacunae of their case and therefore may not be allowed at this stage.

At this stage, when the relevant prosecution witness is still being examined and the document in the form of original complaint has been produced, photocopy of which was already on record and was also supplied to the accused, as such accused does not appear to suffer any prejudice if the original is being taken on record. Accordingly, application is allowed. The document be taken on record and be attached to the original FIR.

Ld. Counsel for accused has stated that during the cross-examination of PW-9, it has come on record that the witness had recorded statement of certain persons during the preliminary inquiry but said statements were not supplied to them and were also not part of unrelayed documents and that he would be moving an application under Section 94 of BNSS for supply of documents and he may also be granted liberty to recall the witness, if required at the later stage. This point would be considered as and when the application is moved.

Witness Sh. Harish Kumar has been examined in chief as PW-9, Cross examined and discharged.

Ld. Sr. P.P. for CBI states that he had received requests from witnesses P. Amrith Raj and R. Ravi Kumar that they may be examined through VC and that they would move a formal application for the same. However, complainant S. Vijayakumar is required to appear in person as he has to bring phone as well as hear and identify the relevant recordings.

Ld. Counsel for accused also states that the presence of complainant S. Vijayakumar is required for his effective cross-examination. Prayer of both the parties seem to be justified.

Despite service of summons complainant S. Vijayakumar has not appeared. In view of the same, issue bailable warrants in the sum of Rs.5,000/- for service of complainant S. Vijayakumar for the NDOH.

Put up for P.E. on **16.04.2026 & 17.04.2026.**

(Dinesh Bhatt)  
Principal District & Sessions Judge-  
cum-Special Judge (PC Act) (CBI),  
Rouse Avenue District Court  
New Delhi/19.03.2026