CBI Vs. Green Valley Plywood Limited & Ors.
FIR No. RC.6(E)/2015/BDI/CBI/BS & FC/ New Delhi
U/s 120B IPC r/w 420,467,468,471 IPC &
Sec. 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of PC Act 1988

21.03.2025

(Present proceedings have been conducted on Hybrid Mode)

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

Ms. Trisha Mittal, Ld. Counsel for A-2 Jagmohan Kejriwal.

Shri A.K. Bhatia, Ld. Counsel for A-11 Sukhdev Raj.

Shri Shailendra Sharma, Ld. Counsel for A-12 Ashok Kumar Raheja.

(A-2) Jagmohan Kejriwal, (A-3) Anju Kejriwal & (A-11) Sukhdev Raj Khinchi have appeared through VC.

Other accused persons are present on bail.

Ld. counsel (A-2) Jagmohan Kejriwal submits that IO had moved an application for return of unrelied documents without disclosing the fact that proceedings in the present matter have been stayed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. She submits that in terms of judgment of Manish Sisodia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement (2024 SCC Online SC 1920) accused persons have right to have list of unrelied documents and also to inspect the unrelied documents. The list of unrelied documents was filed by the IO alongwith the application. Perusal of said application shows that this fact was not disclosed by IO in the said application.

Ld. PP has submitted that Hon'ble High Court has stayed the trial proceedings and returning of unrelied documents and articles are not part of trial proceedings and there is no

infirmity in the order of this court. He submits that list of unrelied documents is already on record. He further submits that accused persons have right to inspect those unrelied documents which remain in custody of CBI but if CBI does not want to keep custody of any article or a document, it cannot be forced to keep the documents in custody and accused persons have no right to inspect such documents. He further submits that if any document mentioned in the list of unrelied documents is of any value to any accused, the said accused can get the said document summoned by moving application u/s 91 & 92 Cr. P.C.

He submits that none of documents which is subject matter of proceeding before Hon'ble High Court has been returned. He further submits that apprehension of accused No.2 and accused No.12 can be addressed by directing the persons to whom documents were returned back to preserve the same till the further orders of the court and such direction can be given by CBI itself.

Be put up for consideration for **24.03.2025**.

ANKIT SINGLA Digitally signed by ANKIT SINGLA Date: 2025.03.22 09:48:38 +0530

(ANKIT SINGLA)
Special Judge (PC Act)(CBI)-02
Rouse Avenue District Court
New Delhi/21.03.2025