



\$~48

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 1052/2026&CRL.M.A. 4171-4172/2026**
M/S VATIKA LIMITED & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas Pahwa, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Mr. Bakul Jain,
Mr. Manit Walia and Mr. Harshit
Melti, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

% **06.02.2026**

1. Petitioners are aggrieved by the order *vide* which they have been summoned to face trial for commission of offence under Section 420 IPC.
2. It is submitted that the transaction in question is of the period 1988-97 and, previously, the concerned complainant had taken recourse to a judicial remedy by invoking jurisdiction of *Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission* and even a civil suit was filed seeking recovery of Rs. 11,03,800/-.
3. Her complaint as well as the civil suit were, eventually, dismissed and it is after a delay of around 30 years that she has filed a complaint which has resulted in summoning of the accused person under Section 420 IPC.
4. The summoning order was challenged before the learned Court of Sessions but such Revision Petition has been dismissed on 27.01.2026.
5. Learned Senior Counsel for petitioners, on instructions, submitted that though the action is highly belated in nature, the petitioners would have no objection to find out amicable settlement of the matter.



6. Issue notice to respondent No.2 through all permissible modes.
7. In the meanwhile, learned Trial Court may though proceed further with the matter but shall not insist for personal appearance of petitioner No.2- Mr. Anil Bhalla, who would be permitted to appear through counsel.
8. List on 27.03.2026.
9. Order *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

MANOJ JAIN, J

FEBRUARY 6, 2026/sw/js