

CBI No. 30/2024 (CNR DLCT11-000071-2024)
RC 050 2021A 0004
CBI SC-II, New Delhi
U/s 120B r/w 420/468 & 471 IPC & 13 (2) r/w 13 (I) (d)
of P.C Act 1988
CBI Vs. M/s Indian Technometal Co. Ltd & Ors.

10.12.2025

Present : Sh. Hari Mohan, Ld. Sr. Public Prosecutor for
CBI.

HIO/Dy.S.P. Subhash Chander & DSP/IO Vinod
Kumar.

**A-2 Rakesh Kumar Sharma is already declared
Proclaimed Absconder vide order dated 04.11.2024.**

**A-8 Vishal Jain already became approver vide order
dated 18.07.2025.**

**A-11 M/s Indian Technolime Company Ltd
proceeded exparte under Section 342(4) of BNSS
2023 vide order dated 17.10.2025**

A-3 Vinay Sharma is absent.

A-12 Dayanand, A-13 Vikas Gupta (VC), A-14 Roshan
Lal (VC), A-15 Pawan Kr Gupta (VC) & A-16
Shailendra Nath, A-4 Madhusudan Rao (VC), A-5
Mukesh Kr. Dave (VC), A-6 Sita Ram Gupta (VC), A-7
Anil Kumar Jain, A-19 Alok Baliyar Singh (VC) & A-20
Shakti Ranjan Dash (VC) are on bail

Sh. Rahul Guatam, Ld. Counsel for A-3.

Sh. Jatin Verma, Ld. Counsel for A-4.

Sh. Sunil Sethi, Sh. Mahesh Kumar Dave and Sh. Sita
Ram Gupta, Ld. Counsel for A-5 and A-6.

Sh. Arun Kumar, Ms. Anushka Barwal and Sh.
Abhishek Mahal, Ld. Counsel for A-7.

Sh. Ram Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for A-13.

Sh. Sunil Dutt Kaushik (VC), Ld. Counsel for A-14 and A-15.

Sh. Anil Kumar, Sh. Amir Khan and Ms. Pinky Singh, & Sh. Ashutosh Vajpayee, Ld. Counsel for A-16.

Sh. Rahul Dev Tyagi (VC), Ld. Legal Aid Counsel for A-12

Sh. Nitish Bhandari (VC), Ld. Counsel for A-18 & A-19.

Sh. Shivam Batra and Sh. Abhishek Bhushan, Ld. Counsel for A-20.

An application seeking exemption from personal appearance is moved on behalf of A-3 Vinay Sharma stating that he is unable to appear before the Court today as he is suffering from viral fever and is patient of high sugar. In view of the submission, **A-3 is exempted from personal appearance only for today.**

At this stage, again time is sought by CBI for filing the amended memo in terms of the previous order thereby clarifying the status of A-17.

Reply to the application i.e. IA No. 22/25 for travel abroad is filed. Copy supplied to the opposite side.

Heard and considered.

Vide separate order of the even date pronounced in the open Court today, IA No. 22/25 stands disposed off.

The corrigendum service report of A-1 & A-10 is also filed. The same is taken on record. The accused persons are duly served through its present Director Vinay Sharma, who is also A-3 in the present case.

It is stated on behalf of A-3 that they do not intend to file the authorization qua appearance on behalf of A-1 & A-10.

The application (IA No. 7/24) is already moved on behalf of the applicant Neeraj Gupta wherein he has claimed that he is not the Director of M/s Indian Technolime Co. Pvt. Ltd. (A-11) in the present case. The said application has become infructuous as on date. That considering the contention of the applicant, M/s Indian Technolime Co. Pvt. Ltd was ordered to be served through A-3 the present Director in terms of the order dated 05.06.2025. A-11 stands duly served as recorded vide order dated 17.10.2025 and is already proceeded ex-parte. IA No. 7/24 stands disposed off.

Similarly, the another application (IA No. 8/24) was moved on behalf of the applicant Aswini Kumar Sahoo claiming to be not the Director of M/s Indian Technometal Co. Pvt. Ltd. (A-1) and M/s BMT Chrome Alloys Pvt. Ltd (A-10). The said contention was also considered and accordingly vide order dated 05.06.2025 the said two companies were ordered to be served through the present Director Sh. Vinay Sharma (who is also A-3 in the present case).

The Original Service Report of the said two companies have been filed today wherein the said two companies were duly served upon through the present Director. No appearance is filed on behalf of A-1 & A-10 and accordingly proceeded ex-parte under Section 342 (4) BNSS. The IA No. 8/24 stands disposed off.

It is stated on behalf of the CBI that earlier A-8 Vishal Jain was representing M/s RT Research Pvt. Ltd. (A-17). However, A-8 is now the approver and therefore, he needs to clarify as to his authority for representing A-17.

Heard and considered.

Notice be issued to Vishal Jain who earlier had filed the authorization for representing A-17 for clarifying as to the said authorization in his favour, consequent to the change of his status as an approver in the present case.

The arguments on charge are not heard awaiting the clarification as to the status of A-17.

At request of Ld. SPP, notice be issued to the IO for the next date of hearing.

Be listed for filing amended memo of parties/further arguments on charge on **12.01.2026 at 11:00 AM.**

(GAGANDEEP SINGH)
Special Judge, PC Act, CBI-04
Rouse Avenue District Courts,
New Delhi: 10.12.2025