

SC No. 7396/2016
DRI VS. PARAMJIT SINGH GULATI & ANR

22.07.2026

Present :- Ms. Mala Sharma, Ld. Counsel for DRI
Ld. Counsels for the accused persons through VC.

This is an application u/s 311 Cr.PC for examining additional witness Ms. Nitu Vats, daughter of Sh. Anoop Singh (since deceased).

Reply to the said application filed on behalf of accused Paramjit Singh Gulati.

It is submitted that DRI had cited Sh Anoop Singh as a witness in the present case. However, he expired on 09.01.2026. It is submitted that several essential documents bear the signatures of Sh. Anoop Singh and his daughter would be the best person to prove his signatures. It is therefore, prayed that the application be allowed and PW Nitu Vats be summoned for proving the signatures of Sh. Anoop Singh.

Ld. Counsel for the accused submit that the application filed by prosecution is vague and devoid of any provision of law. It is submitted that the DRI seeks to summon a witness for identification of signatures of Sh. Anoop Singh, which has already been identified by other witnesses. It is submitted that the complaint in the matter was filed on 17.09.2012, charges were framed on 05.11.2014 and thereafter, 44 witnesses were examined by the DRI. Thereafter, DRI vide application u/s 311 Cr.PC brought on record 42 new witnesses to be examined and Ms. Neetu Vats was not mentioned in the said list also. It is further submitted that DRI ought to have examined the public witnesses first, however, they examined the investigating officers and official

witnesses first and now summons are being issued to public witnesses at such delayed stage. It is further submitted that no death verification report has been filed qua the demise of Sh. Anoop Singh. It is submitted that despite repeated directions from the Court, the DRI failed to file a list of witnesses who have already been examined, yet to be examined and can be dropped being repetitive in nature and otherwise. It is submitted that piecemeal summoning of witnesses has an adverse impact upon the pace of the trial. It is further submitted that the signatures of Sh. Anoop Singh have been identified by PW1, PW8 and PW20 and that supplementation of their testimony through Nitu Vats on the same aspect would serve no purpose other than delaying the matter. As such, the present application holds no merit being rendered infructuous. It is further submitted that PW Nitu Vats cannot by any stretch of examination, prove the presence of PW Anoop Singh at the alleged place of recovery. It is further submitted that proof of document is not proof of its contents and therefore, her testimony, even if relates to the alleged search and seizure will be hearsay and inadmissible.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

The charges in the matter were framed on 05.11.2014. The prosecution had ample opportunities to examine public witnesses. It is also pertinent to note that in the supplementary chargesheet also the prosecution did not cite Nitu Vats as a witness. The trial is already delayed. However, in the interest of justice and to decide the lis on merits, the application of

//3//

the prosecution to call PW Nitu Vats is allowed to prove the handwriting and signature of her father PW Anoop Singh on the documents already filed on record and nothing else. **Let PW Nitu Vats be summoned for the next date.**

It is made clear that **only one effective opportunity shall be granted to the DRI to examine the said witness failing which the opportunity shall be closed.**

Application disposed off accordingly.

List on date fixed i.e., 10.08.2026 for PE.

(Ajay Garg)
Special Judge-NDPS/ASJ (South)
Saket Courts/22.07.2026