

T. P. CrI. No. 39/2026, 40/2026 and 41/2026.
Inderjeet Singh vs. Sangram Singh Cheema, Ojas Dhir vs.
Sangram Singh and Gurmat Pal Singh vs. Sangram Singh.

06.06.2026

Present: Sh. Pratap Dhaka, counsel for applicant.
Sh. Digpal Singh, Advocate for the respondent.

Reply filed. Copy given. Arguments heard.

There are three connected transfer applications in which applicants are different but respondent is same. Three complaint cases bearing no. 737/19, 746/19 and 1171/19 under Section 138 of NI Act were filed on 22.02.2018 by different three applicants against the same respondent/accused which are pending in the court of Ms. Sonam Singh and are now fixed for 13.07.2026. These three cases were at the defence evidence stage but an application was moved by the accused for recalling the complainant under Section 311 Cr PC which was allowed and now the matter is fixed for cross examination of the complainant on next date of hearing in these cases. Record also shows that the present applicants/ complainants are trying to avoid coming in the court for their cross examination.

One another complaint case bearing CC no. 563/19 is pending in the court of Sh. Ankit Solanki (now in the court of Sh. Prithvi Joshi) filed on 11.02.2019 by one of the applicant Inderjeet Singh against the respondent Sangram Singh which is fixed for 18.07.2026 which is still at the stage of complainant evidence. Though the evidence of the complainant has been recorded but still other two applicants are to appear there as witnesses.

Applicants who are the complainants in the above mentioned cases alleged in their respective present transfer applications that transactions are same, so all these cases should be clubbed together and be tried in one court. They want that all these cases be transferred to the court of Sh. Ankit Solanki (now in the court of Sh. Prithvi Joshi).

Respondent though is opposing all these three transfer applications but also is saying that in case transfer is to be done then the case no. 563/2019 be transferred to the court of Ms. Sonam Singh and not vice versa because the complainants/applicants are trying to delay the three matters and intentionally are not coming forward for their cross examination.

I have summoned the trial court record of all the above mentioned four cases and found that the three cases pending in the court of Ms. Sonam Singh are at the last stage whereas the subsequent filed case pending in the court of Sh. Ankit Solanki (now in the court of Sh. Prithvi Joshi) is still at complainant evidence stage which is likely to take more time for conclusion of the trial.

I have also checked the pendency record maintained by the office and found that there are 1927 total cases as on 31.05.2026 in the court of Ms. Sonam Singh whereas there are 5806 cases as on 31.05.2026 in the court of Sh. Prithvi Joshi. It means the pendency is much more in the court of Sh. Prithvi Joshi in which the complainants/applicants want to get their matters transferred. The ordersheets of the court of Ms. Sonam Singh point out that she is taking much pain for early disposal of the cases and even passing some harsh orders against the applicants that is why they appears to be not interested for

disposal of their cases in that court.

Further more, it is also found from the record that once the respondent Sangram Singh filed transfer application bearing TP CrI no. 46/25 in this court for transfer of all four cases in one court which was dismissed on 01.09.2025 by my Ld. Predecessor by holding that transactions were different in all the cases, cheques were of different dates, notices were sent on different dates and there were no common facts. The observation also came that every case requires separate evidence and there is no apprehension of any conflicting decisions.

When an observation has already come that the transactions in the above-mentioned four cases are different though it may be similar type, then the plea taken by applicants that all these four cases should be clubbed together and decided by the same court is not correct. The intention behind moving these transfer application on the part of the applicants/complainants is clear that they themselves want to linger on their cases when the concerned court of Ms. Sonam Singh is trying for early disposal and that is why she is even taking harsh steps.

After considering the above facts and circumstances, I am of the opinion that these three transfer applications cannot be allowed and accordingly are rejected. Copy of this order be kept in all the three files. The copy of this order alongwith the TCR summoned be returned to both the courts concerned and all these three transfer application files be consigned to record room.

(Ashwani Kumar Sarpal)
Principal District & Sessions Judge
East District, KKD Delhi/06.06.2026