



\$~39

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3517/2022**

**VINOD PANWAR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Mishra,  
Advocate.

versus

**HARIKESH**

.....Respondent

Through: None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE**

**ORDER**

**12.02.2026**

%

1. It is the case of the petitioner that learned Trial Court while passing the impugned order dismissed the petitioner's application wherein a fresh Status Report was sought to be called from the State, even though the same was based on the developments as asserted in paragraphs nos.2 to 4 of the application, solely on the ground that the "*application is not maintainable in law at the stage when matter is listed for pre summoning evidence*", learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the said order is liable to be set aside.

2. Since, as per office report, service through ordinary post and Speed Post has been refused by the respondent's wife, and for all practical purposes, respondent is deemed 'served', in the interest of justice renotify on 21.05.2026.

**SAURABH BANERJEE, J**

**FEBRUARY 12, 2026/NA**