

20.07.2026

Present:- Sh. Vijay Pal Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the
Revisionist.
Sh. R.K. Gurjar, Ld. Chief Public Prosecutor for
State / Respondent no.1.
Sh. Ravinder, Ld. Counsel for Respondents no.2 and
3 through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the revisionist submits that respondent has assured to make a payment of Rs.10 Lakhs by 31st July and therefore, the case be adjourned.

Arguments heard on the revision petition.

Present revision petition has been filed assailing the order dated 03.07.2024 (in short **“impugned order”**) passed by Ld. JMFC-06, South, Saket Courts, New Delhi (in short **“Trial Court”**) vide which the complaint filed by the revisionist / complainant has been dismissed by the Ld. Trial Court observing that the present complaint is not maintainable as no part of jurisdiction has arisen within the jurisdiction of this Court.

Ld. Counsel for the revisionist submits that the complaint was filed by the revisionist in the jurisdiction of PS Hauz Khas as at that time, the respondent no.2 was residing within the jurisdiction of PS Hauz Khas.

Per contra, Ld. Counsel for the the respondents no.2 and 3 submits that the Court has rightly rejected the application under Section 156(3) Cr.PC as the alleged cause of action i.e.

Contd./-...

misrepresentation and the transaction in respect of grant of loan of Rs.10 lakhs to the respondent no.2 has taken place in Greater Kailash. He submits that the initial complaint was also filed by the revisionist in PS Greater Kailash. Therefore, Ld. Trial Court has rightly rejected the application of the revisionist and dismissed the complaint.

Ld. Counsel for the revisionist submits that the respondent no.2 has assured before the police of PS Hauz Khas to return the amount of Rs.10 lakhs.

I have heard Ld. counsel for the parties and have perused the record of revision petition as well as the Trial Court record.

As per the submissions of Ld. Counsel for the revisionist, the misrepresentation was made by the respondent no.2 in Greater Kailash and her house was also in Greater Kailash and Rs.10 lakhs was transferred by the complainant / revisionist in the bank account of Respondent no.2 of IDFC First Bank, which is also in Greater Kailash. Therefore, in my view, the entire cause of action arose within the jurisdiction of PS Greater Kailash and not in the jurisdiction of PS Hauz Khas.

Merely because, later on, respondents no.2 and 3 shifted their residence in the jurisdiction of PS Hauz Khas, same does not confer the jurisdiction of PS Hauz Khas. Further, even if, I accept the contention of Ld. Counsel for revisionist that police of Greater Kailash has not taken action on the complaint of revisionist on the ground that respondents have shifted their

Contd./-...

// 3 //

residence in Hauz Khas then the complainant should have file the complaint case in the Court having jurisdiction of PS Greater Kailash and not in PS Hauz Khas.

Further, admittedly the bank account of Respondent no.2 is in Greater Kailash Branch therefore, neither any bank transaction took place within PS Hauz Khas nor alleged misrepresentation was done in PS Hauz Khas, hence, no cause of action arose within the jurisdiction of PS Hauz Khas.

In view of the above, I hold that Ld. Trial Court has passed a well reasoned order and there is no illegality, impropriety or infirmity in the impugned order dated 03.07.2024. Thus, there is no ground to set aside the same. **The revision petition is accordingly dismissed.**

A copy of this order along with Trial Court record be sent back to the Ld. Trial Court.

Revision file be consigned to Record room.

(SANJEEV KUMAR AGGARWAL)
Principal District & Sessions Judge (South)
Saket Courts, New Delhi / 20.07.2026