



IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-05
NEW DELHI DISTRICT : PATIALA HOUSE COURTS : NEW DELHI

Criminal Revision No. 502/2025

In the matter of :-

Vikas Malu
S/o Late Sh. Mulchand Malu
R/o Villa 43, Hills View Estate
Dubai Hills, Dubai, UAE

.....Revisionist
(represented by Ld. Sr. Counsel Sh. Tanvir Ahmed Mir
along with Sh. Saud Khan and Sh. Pulkit Shree)

Versus

Directorate General of GST Intelligence
Ghaziabad Regional Unit (Meerut Zonal Unit)
4th & 5th Floor, Arrow Corporate Tower,
Plot No. 6, Sector 14, Kaushambi,
Ghaziabad- 201012

....Respondent
(represented by Ld. Sr. Standing Counsel Sh. Atul Tripathi
along with Sh. Gaurav Mavi and Sh. Shubham Mishra)

Criminal Revision Under Section 438 R/w Section 440 of BNSS

Date of institution	:	06.09.2025
Date when judgment reserved	:	30.01.2026
Date of Judgment	:	30.01.2026



J U D G M E N T

1. INTRODUCTION

- (a) The present Criminal Revision Petition has been filed by the Revisionist under Section 438 read with Section 440 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) seeking to set aside the order dated 22.08.2025 passed by the Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate (CJM), Patiala House District Courts, New Delhi, whereby the application of the Revisionist seeking revocation/recall of the Look Out Circular (LOC) issued by the Respondent Department was dismissed on the ground of lack of territorial jurisdiction.
- (b) At the outset, it is placed on record that Ld. Counsel for the Revisionist has fairly conceded that the arguments advanced by both parties have been duly and extensively recorded in the order dated 12.01.2026 passed by this Court in IA No. 01/2026 in the present Criminal Revision Petition. Ld. Counsel for the Revisionist has specifically stated that the said order dated 12.01.2026 contains detailed reasoning on the issue of territorial jurisdiction and has covered all arguments relating to the merits of the revision petition. Accordingly, Ld. Counsel for the Revisionist has requested that the present revision petition be disposed of on merits, as the court has taken a particular view as recorded in the order dated 12.01.2026.



(c) In view of the aforesaid concession and request made by Ld. Counsel for the Revisionist, this Court proceeds to dispose the present revision petition on merits.

2. THE IMPUGNED ORDER

For ready reference, the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 passed by the Ld. CJM, Patiala House District Courts, New Delhi is reproduced hereinbelow:

“1. The present application has been filed by the petitioner seeking appropriate orders/ directions for the IO in the above captioned file/ case to have the Look Out Circular (LOC) issued against the petitioner revoked/ recalled on immediate basis or other appropriate orders.

2. Submissions on the present application have been heard at length. Matter is fixed for orders today. The Petitioner has sought for directions to the IO for rescission of the LOC essentially on the ground that he was granted anticipatory bail by the Court of Ld. ASJ-03 vide Order dated 11.07.2025 and he is likely to face difficulties while entering the country at the concerned airport, given the fact that he is presently based overseas and an LOC is already opened, which may lead to curtailment of his liberty at the airport upon arrival. The Petitioner seeks the aforesaid prayer in this background placing reliance on the judgment titled Sumer Singh Salkan Vs. Assistant Director and Ors. (Writ Petition Crl. 1315/2018) (date of decision 11.08.2010) stating that this Court is well within its powers to grant the relief as prayed in the wake of the observations in the said ruling by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court. The prayer is necessary and pressing so as to enable the accused to freely arrive in India and so as to effectively join the investigation without unnecessary curtailment of rights at the port of arrival which could be the one at Delhi. The accused has already been granted anticipatory bail by a Delhi Court and therefore there is no lacking as far as territorial jurisdiction is concerned to entertain the petition. It was further argued that the petitioner was not served with any notice to join the investigation and the LOC was issued much prior in time. No conditions have been imposed vide Order dated 11.07.2025 by the Ld. Sessions Court. Furthermore, previously also the Hon'ble Delhi High Court has granted similar relief in petition which was pending there. The offence involved is punishable with maximum sentence of imprisonment up to 05 years. In



view of the same, the relief prayed may be granted. There is also a reference made in the course of the arguments to the Orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 29.04.2025 in WP CrI. 3349/2024 titled Vikas Malu Vs. Union of India and Order dated 28.05.2025 passed in Criminal M. C. No. 3897/2025 titled DGGI Vs. Vikas Malu by the Hon'ble High Court.

3. The Ld. Senior Standing Counsel for the Department has vehemently opposed the request/ petition before this court stating that the same is not maintainable at the very initial threshold examination from the initial perspective of territorial jurisdiction. It has been argued that the investigation underway is being conducted by DGGI Ghaziabad Unit, which is an admitted case and therefore the proper jurisdictional Court to seek the relief herein would be the Special Court of Ld. CJM, Meerut. The grant of anticipatory bail does not itself confer jurisdiction onto this Court to entertain the present application as the law relied upon by the petitioner in Sumer Singh Salkan Vs. Assistant Director and Ors. (Supra) also requires such a relief to be pressed before only the concerned Court where either the case itself is pending or a court which has the jurisdiction over the concerned investigative agency. The Prosecution Complaint has not been filed before this Court and the territorial jurisdiction lies only in the Court at Meerut. The issue of jurisdiction was also before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and continues to be alive in the challenge to the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner by the Ld. Sessions Court, pressed in CrI. M. C. No. 5354/2025 titled as DGGI Vs. Vilas Malu wherein notice has been issued by Hon'ble High Court vide Order dated 07.08.2025, with the matter listed next for 28.10.2025. This Court does not have the jurisdiction to pass any orders concerning an executive process opened at the instance of the agency. There is also reliance placed on the ruling in Chaitya Shah Vs. Union of India by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Criminal Appellate Jurisdiction (Criminal Writ Petition 3058/2021) dated 17.11.2025 to assert as to counter submissions of the petitioner that an LOC need not necessarily be issued on the basis of a past activity, but could also be issued on the apprehension of a future conduct.

Considering the rival submissions and the record available, it is observed that it is an admitted case that there is no prosecution complaint filed or pending before this Court nor is one mentioned as proposed to be filed here as on date. It is the DGGI Zonal Unit of Ghaziabad which is probing into the matter. The criteria for grant of anticipatory bail by the Ld. Sessions Court or Superior Court are entirely different as compared to the special relief prayed for in the present petition, which is with respect to an executive process.



*4. Considering the law relied upon by the petitioner himself in **Sumer Singh Salkan Vs. Assistant Director and Ors. (supra)**, as also considering the fact that this Court is not in seisin of the prosecution complaint or the matter per se connected therewith, the petition is found to be not maintainable before this Court. The petitioner clearly has had sufficient time to approach the concerned jurisdictional Court. The petition is accordingly dismissed for above discussed reasons.*

Copy of the order be given dasti.”

(emphasis supplied)

3. GROUNDS OF REVISION

(a) The Revisionist has challenged the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 on the following grounds amongst others:

- i. That the impugned order has been passed on erroneous interpretation of law with respect to Sections 197 and 198 of the BNSS, 2023, inasmuch as the Ld. CJM has failed to appreciate that the courts at Delhi have territorial jurisdiction in the present matter.
- ii. That the Ld. CJM misdirected itself in concluding that merely because no complaint is pending before the court, therefore the court does not have the jurisdiction to entertain the application for revocation of LOC.
- iii. That the Ld. CJM failed to appreciate that the Court of Ld. Additional Sessions Judge (ASJ) at Patiala House Courts, New Delhi while entertaining anticipatory bail had already held vide orders dated 23.05.2025 and 11.07.2025 that the courts in Delhi have jurisdiction to entertain proceedings arising out of enquiry proceedings initiated by the Respondent DGGI.



- iv. That the impugned order erroneously creates a distinction between an application for anticipatory bail and an application for revocation of LOC for the purposes of possessing territorial jurisdiction.
- v. That the Ld. CJM failed to consider that the Revisionist is a resident of Delhi, his premises in Delhi were searched by the Respondent Department, and the company namely M/s Kuber Khaini Private Limited is incorporated out of Delhi and has its registered office at Pusa Road, Delhi, thereby conferring jurisdiction on courts at Delhi.
- vi. That the continued operation of the LOC by the Respondent amounts to willful and contumacious disregard of the order dated 11.07.2025 passed by the Ld. ASJ granting anticipatory bail without any travel embargo except prior intimation.
- vii. That once anticipatory bail has been granted without fetters on travel, coercive measures such as LOC ought not to be continued mechanically, and the Ld. CJM failed to apply the principles laid down in **Jagadish Nangineni v. Directorate of Enforcement & Ors., 2024 SCC OnLine Del 6253**.

4. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

- (a) **Arguments on behalf of the Revisionist:** The Ld. Counsel for the Revisionist has conceded that the arguments advanced on behalf of the Revisionist have been extensively recorded in the order



dated 12.01.2026 passed by this Court in IA No. 01/2026 in the present Criminal Revision Petition. The same may be summarized as follows:

- i. It was submitted that the continuation of LOC despite the absence of any judicial restriction on travel amounts to executive continuation of restraint, which effectively defeats the letter and spirit of the anticipatory bail order dated 11.07.2025.
- ii. It was argued that the bail order imposes no fetters on travel except seven days prior intimation, and absent specific restrictions, coercive measures such as LOC ought not to be continued mechanically.
- iii. Ld. Counsel emphasized that the Revisionist has acted with utmost bona fides, has joined inquiry six times, has furnished a bond of Rs. 3 crores, and has repeatedly sought clarification from the Department regarding his requirement to appear.
- iv. It was submitted that since 12.11.2025, the Department has not called the Revisionist to join inquiry, which is a clear indication that he is not required for purposes of inquiry.
- v. Regarding the issue of jurisdiction, it was argued that Delhi courts have territorial jurisdiction as the Revisionist is a resident of Delhi, his premises in Delhi were searched, the



company under inquiry is registered and incorporated in Delhi, and the Ld. Sessions Court has already exercised jurisdiction by granting anticipatory bail to the Revisionist.

vi. It was further argued that the request for issuance/opening of the LOC issued by Delhi office of respondent and is addressed to and processed by the Bureau of Immigration headquartered in Delhi, giving rise to part of the cause of action within this jurisdiction.

(b) **Arguments on behalf of the Respondent Department:** The Ld. SSC for the Respondent Department has conceded that the arguments advanced on behalf of the Respondent have been extensively recorded in the order dated 12.01.2026 passed by this Court in IA No. 01/2026. The same may be summarized as follows:

- i. Ld. Senior Standing Counsel (SSC) for the Respondent Department vehemently opposed the application and raised a preliminary and threshold objection regarding the jurisdiction of the courts at Delhi to entertain the present application.
- ii. It was forcefully argued by the Ld. SSC that the LOC was opened/issued by the competent authority of the Respondent Department following due procedure, and the same was examined in detail by the Ld. CJM, Patiala House Court, Delhi, who passed a detailed order dated 22.08.2025



(impugned order) rejecting the Revisionist's application for revocation of LOC.

- iii. The Ld. SSC particularly emphasized the jurisdictional aspect and submitted that courts at Delhi do not have the jurisdiction to modify, alter, or suspend the LOC issued by the Department when the investigation is being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit.
- iv. It was argued that if such jurisdiction is recognized and permitted, it would lead to absurd consequences where any accused across the country could approach courts at Delhi for challenging LOC issued by the Department merely because the head office of the Department is located in Delhi, or because part of the offence may have been committed in Delhi.
- v. The Ld. SSC submitted that the investigation in the present case pertains to activities at M/s Reliable Industries, Chandausi, and the offence, if any, has territorial connection with Uttar Pradesh, specifically the jurisdiction of Meerut Courts.
- vi. It was argued that summons dated 12.09.2024 and 24.09.2024 were issued by the Senior Intelligence Officer, Regional Unit- Ghaziabad, and the address at which the Revisionist was required to join enquiries and the designation and address of



the summoning authority clearly indicate that the investigation is being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit.

- vii. The Ld. SSC placed strong reliance on the principles of territorial jurisdiction and submitted that when an investigation is being conducted by a specific regional office of an investigating agency, the accused should approach the court having jurisdiction over that agency's office for any relief, including matters relating to LOC.
- viii. It was argued that accepting the Revisionist's contention would lead to forum shopping, multiplicity of proceedings, inconsistency in judicial orders, and would severely hamper the investigation process.
- ix. The Ld. SSC submitted that the Revisionist is not free to approach any court of his choice by merely alleging that the Department's head office is in Delhi. The relevant consideration is where the specific regional office conducting the investigation is situated and which court has territorial jurisdiction over that office.
- x. On merits, the Ld. SSC submitted that the Revisionist has failed to comply with the mandatory condition of appearing on the 1st and 15th of every month and that the investigation is ongoing in a matter involving economic offence of magnitude of Rs. 472.61 crores.



5. FINDINGS ON THE GROUNDS OF REVISION

- (a) This Court has carefully considered the submissions advanced by Ld. Counsels for the Revisionist and the Respondent Department. This Court has also perused the revision petition, the reply filed by the Respondent, the impugned order dated 22.08.2025, and the material placed on record. This Court has further taken into consideration the detailed order dated 12.01.2026 passed in IA No. 01/2026, which contains extensive reasoning on the issue of territorial jurisdiction.
- (b) As noted at the outset, Ld. Counsel for the Revisionist has fairly conceded that the arguments and reasoning recorded in the order dated 12.01.2026 have duly covered all arguments raised by revisionist relating to the merits of the present revision petition. In view of this concession, this Court adopts and incorporates the reasoning contained in the order dated 12.01.2026 for deciding the present revision petition on merits.

6. ISSUE OF TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION

- (a) The threshold issue that arises for consideration in the present revision petition is: *whether the courts at Delhi, particularly the Ld. CJM, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi, had territorial jurisdiction to entertain the application filed by the Revisionist seeking revocation/recall of the Look Out Circular (LOC) issued by the Respondent Department?*



(b) The arguments advanced by the Ld. Senior Standing Counsel for the Respondent Department on the issue of jurisdiction merit serious consideration and acceptance. The fundamental question is whether courts at Delhi have territorial jurisdiction to direct suspension, modification, or revocation of an LOC issued by the Department in connection with an investigation being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit.

7. UNDISPUTED FACTS

- (a) It is an undisputed fact on record that the summons dated 12.09.2024 and 24.09.2024 were issued by the Senior Intelligence Officer, DGGI, Ghaziabad Regional Unit, requiring the Revisionist to appear at the office situated at Arrow Corporate Tower, Sector-14, Kaushambi, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh. This clearly indicates that the investigation is being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit, which falls within the territorial jurisdiction of courts at Meerut, Uttar Pradesh.
- (b) It is also an admitted position that the investigation pertains to alleged clandestine manufacturing and sale of Kuber brand Khaini by M/s Reliable Industries, Chandausi, in alleged connivance with M/s Kuber Group. The territorial connection of the alleged offence is with Uttar Pradesh, specifically within the jurisdiction of Meerut Court.



8. EXAMINATION OF THE IMPUGNED ORDER

- (a) It is noteworthy that the Ld. CJM, Patiala House Court, Delhi, while rejecting the Revisionist's application for revocation of LOC vide impugned order dated 22.08.2025, has examined the issue of territorial jurisdiction. The Ld. CJM has held that the court at Delhi does not have territorial jurisdiction to entertain an application for revocation/modification of LOC when the investigation is being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit having concerned court at Meerut, Uttar Pradesh.
- (b) This Court is of the considered opinion that the reasoning of the Ld. CJM, insofar as it pertains to the issue of jurisdiction of the court at Delhi to entertain an application for revocation/modification of LOC in the facts and circumstances of the present case, does not suffer from any apparent infirmity.

9. PRINCIPLES OF TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION

- (a) The LOC has been issued by the competent authority of the Respondent Department in connection with an investigation being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit. The offence under investigation pertains to alleged clandestine manufacturing and sale of Kuber brand Khaini by M/s Reliable Industries, Chandausi, in alleged connivance with M/s Kuber Group. The territorial connection of the alleged offence is with Uttar Pradesh, specifically within the jurisdiction of Meerut.



(b) If courts at Delhi were to assume jurisdiction to modify, alter, or suspend the LOC issued by the Department in such circumstances, it would create a dangerous precedent. It would mean that any accused person anywhere in the country could approach courts at Delhi for the purpose of challenging the LOC issued by the Department merely because:

- i. The head office of the Department is located in Delhi; or
- ii. The accused happens to reside in Delhi; or
- iii. Part of the alleged offence may have some connection with Delhi.

(c) Such an interpretation would lead to absolute chaos in the administration of criminal justice and would encourage rampant forum shopping. Accused persons would cherry-pick forums based on their convenience rather than approaching the court having proper territorial jurisdiction over the investigation.

10. RELEVANT PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE

The relevant principles that govern the issue of territorial jurisdiction in matters of this nature are as follows:

- (a) **Principle of Situs of Investigation:** When an investigation is being conducted by a specific office of an investigating agency, the accused should approach the court having jurisdiction over that agency's office for any relief.
- (b) **Irrelevance of Head Office Location:** The contention that the head office of the investigating agency is located in Delhi does not



entitle an accused to approach courts at Delhi. If this argument were accepted, it would lead to absurd consequences - all bail applications for cases investigated by central agencies would have to be filed at Delhi merely because their headquarters are located in the national capital, which is clearly an untenable proposition.

- (c) **Prevention of Forum Shopping:** Accepting jurisdiction based on residence of accused or location of head office would encourage forum shopping, lead to multiplicity of proceedings, create inconsistency in judicial orders, and severely hamper the investigation process.
- (d) **Problem of Multiple Jurisdictions in Multi-Accused Cases:** In investigations involving multiple accused persons across different locations, if each accused were permitted to approach the court nearest to them, it would result in applications being filed in multiple places across the country, leading to chaos and conflicting orders from different courts on the same set of facts.
- (e) **Benefits of Single Jurisdiction:** Entertaining applications at the place where the investigating agency's office is located and where the matter will ultimately be tried serves important purposes - it provides certainty, prevents forum shopping, ensures judicial economy, facilitates efficient investigation, ensures consistency in judicial approach, and promotes better coordination.



- (f) **Duty of Accused to Approach Appropriate Court:** Once an accused is aware that the investigation is being carried out by a particular office of the investigating agency, it is incumbent upon him to approach the court having jurisdiction over that office for any relief.

11. APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES TO PRESENT FACTS

- (a) Applying these principles to the facts of the present case, the appropriate forum for the Revisionist to seek relief regarding suspension or modification of LOC is the court at Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, which has territorial jurisdiction over Ghaziabad Regional Unit of respondent, where the investigation is being conducted.
- (b) The Revisionist cannot be permitted to invoke the jurisdiction of courts at Delhi merely on the ground that his company may have some registered office in Delhi, or that the head office of the Respondent Department is located in Delhi, or that he is a resident of Delhi. Such grounds are insufficient to confer jurisdiction upon courts at Delhi for matters arising out of investigations conducted by regional units located outside Delhi.
- (c) In the present case, the following undisputed facts clearly establish that the territorial jurisdiction lies with courts at Meerut, Uttar Pradesh:



- i. The investigation pertains to alleged clandestine manufacturing and sale activities involving M/s Reliable Industries, Chandausi, and M/s Kuber Group.
- ii. Summons were issued by the Senior Intelligence Officer, DGGI, Ghaziabad Regional Unit, requiring the Revisionist to appear at Ghaziabad.
- iii. The territorial connection of the alleged offence is with Uttar Pradesh.
- iv. The investigation is being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit, which falls within the jurisdiction of Meerut.

12.DISTINGUISHING THE GRANT OF ANTICIPATORY BAIL

- (a) The Revisionist has contended that since anticipatory bail was granted by the Ld. ASJ, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi, therefore the courts at Delhi have jurisdiction to entertain the application for revocation of LOC as well. This contention is not acceptable.
- (b) The grant of anticipatory bail by a court does not automatically and necessarily confer jurisdiction upon that court to pass all subsequent orders relating to the investigation. The jurisdiction for granting anticipatory bail and the jurisdiction for entertaining an application for revocation of LOC are on different footing and cannot be compared.
- (c) In the present case, while the Ld. ASJ may have entertained the anticipatory bail application and granted relief, it does not follow



that the courts at Delhi have jurisdiction to entertain an application for revocation of LOC when the investigation is being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit.

13. CONCLUSION ON JURISDICTIONAL ISSUE

- (a) In light of the aforesaid facts, circumstances and legal principles, this Court is of the firm opinion that the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 passed by the Ld. CJM, to the extent that it holds that the court at Delhi does not have jurisdiction to entertain applications for revocation/modification of LOC issued in connection with investigations being conducted by regional units outside Delhi, is correct and does not suffer from any jurisdictional infirmity.
- (b) The said LOC cannot be modified, altered, or suspended by courts at Delhi when the investigation is being conducted by a regional unit at Gaziabad, having concerned court at Meerut, Uttar Pradesh.
- (c) If courts at Delhi were to entertain such applications and grant relief, it would open floodgates for accused persons across the country to approach courts at Delhi for challenging LOCs issued by the Department merely because the head office is situated in Delhi or because some part of the alleged offence may have been committed in Delhi. This would lead to forum shopping, multiplicity of proceedings, and inconsistency in orders, which cannot be permitted.



14. OTHER GROUNDS RAISED BY THE REVISIONIST

- (a) The Revisionist has also raised various other grounds challenging the continuation of the LOC on merits, including contentions regarding non-compliance with due process, violation of principles laid down in judicial precedents, and the absence of any travel embargo in the anticipatory bail order.
- (b) However, since this Court has held that the courts at Delhi do not have territorial jurisdiction to entertain the application for revocation of LOC in the facts and circumstances of the present case, it is not necessary to adjudicate upon these other grounds on merits.
- (c) It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the Revisionist's contentions regarding the legality or propriety of the LOC. These contentions may be raised by the Revisionist before the appropriate court having territorial jurisdiction, which court shall examine the same on merits in accordance with law without being influenced by any observations made in the present order on the issue of territorial jurisdiction.

15. CONCLUSION

- (a) For the reasons elaborated above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 passed by the Ld. CJM, Patiala House District Courts, New Delhi, dismissing the application of the Revisionist for revocation/recall of the LOC



on the ground of lack of territorial jurisdiction, is legally sound and does not suffer from any error warranting interference in revisional jurisdiction.

- (b) The Ld. Trial Court has correctly held that it lacks jurisdiction to entertain the application for revocation/modification of the Look Out Circular (LOC) issued by the Respondent Department in connection with an investigation being conducted by the Ghaziabad Regional Unit, with respect to which the concerned court having territorial jurisdiction is at Meerut, Uttar Pradesh.
- (c) The contentions raised by the Revisionist regarding the merits of the case, including the legality and propriety of the LOC, non-compliance with judicial orders, and other grounds, are matters which may be agitated by the Revisionist before the appropriate court having territorial jurisdiction. This Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of these contentions.

16.ORDER

- (a) In view of the aforesaid discussion, findings and conclusions, the present Criminal Revision Petition No. 502 of 2025 is hereby dismissed, thereby upholding the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 passed by the Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala House District Courts, New Delhi.
- (b) However, liberty is granted to the Revisionist to approach the concerned court having territorial jurisdiction at Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, for seeking any relief as may be available to him in law,



including suspension or modification of the Look Out Circular, and any other relief that he may be entitled to under law.

(c) The concerned court at Meerut may examine the contentions raised by the Revisionist on merits in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations made in the present order or in the order dated 12.01.2026, which observations are confined solely to the issue of territorial jurisdiction.

17. Copy of this order be sent to the Ld. Trial Court.

18. File be consigned to Record Room.

**Pronounced in open court on this
30th day of January, 2026**

**(Saurabh Partap Singh Laler)
ASJ-05 New Delhi
Patiala House Courts Delhi
30.01.2026**