



\$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C. 1481/2025 & CRL.M.A. 6616/2025**

SHRI MITHUN.S.L

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. V. Elanchezhian, Mr. Jawaid H.
Khan and Mr. J. Dharanidharan,
Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for State
with ASI Rajesh Kumar, PS: Uttam
Nagar and SI Bharat Singh, PS:
Uttam Nagar and ASI Sh. Krishan,
CAW Cell, Dwarka

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **03.03.2025**

CRL.M.A. 6617/2025 (for exemption)

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 1481/2025

3. This petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:-

“a) pass appropriate order(s) thereby quashing of F.I.R. bearing No.0548 dated 30.11.2024 pending in the file of Uttam Nagar P.S registered under sections 85/316(2)/3(5) of Bharathiyaa Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and other consequential proceedings thereto in the larger interest of justice;”

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that complainant/Respondent has filed a complaint in Chennai on 06.06.2024 alleging inter-alia dowry demands and cruelty. He contends the preliminary inquiry found no substantial evidence.



5. He states that subsequently, the complainant/Respondent has filed the subject FIR on 30.11.2024 against the Petitioners. He states that the allegations made in the FIR registered at Delhi are exaggerated claims against the Petitioner no. 1, his mother i.e. Petitioner no. 2 and sister i.e. Petitioner no. 3. He states that Respondent No. 2 is a patient of Parkinson's disease and therefore, the allegations of physical cruelty against Petitioner No. 2 are apparently false and not maintainable.
6. He states that the allegations in the complaint filed at Chennai vis-à-vis the complaint filed at Delhi are materially inconsistent and show that facts have been alleged to maintain a false complaint.
7. He states without prejudice that since an inquiry has already been initiated by the police at Chennai at the behest of the complainant/Respondent, compelling the Petitioner to face criminal proceedings in two jurisdictions for the same facts is an abuse of process.
8. He states that therefore, the present proceedings in Delhi are not maintainable and offence, if any, has to be tried at Chennai.
9. Issue notice. Learned APP accepts notice.
10. He seeks and is granted time to file a status report. Let the same be filed at least one (1) week prior to the next date of hearing.
11. Upon steps being taken by the Petitioner, issue notice to the complainant/Respondent No. 4 through all modes.
12. Learned counsel for the Petitioner seeks and is granted one week time to file additional documents.
13. List on 14.04.2025.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

MARCH 03, 2025/rhc/AKT