



\$~74

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 5930/2023&CRL.M.A. 22270/2023**

HARI KRISHAN AGGARWALPetitioner

Through: Mr. Karan Gupta, Advocate.
versus

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT BOARD & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Subhangda Singh, Advocate
(through Vc).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **16.01.2025**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the latter was neither a director nor holding any position of being in-charge in the accused company, and therefore, was not responsible for conducting day-to-day business of the said company at all.
3. Attention of this Court is drawn to the impugned complaint filed by the complainant wherein, in the memo of parties, the petitioner has been arrayed as “accused no. 5” in the capacity as “Business Associate”.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent, on pointed query from this Court, submits that the petitioner was a guarantor to the agreement and he was not the director in the accused company.
5. Let the response be filed to the present petition before the next date of hearing, with an advance copy to learned counsel for the petitioner.
6. List on 06.05.2025.



7. In the meantime, proceeding before the learned Trial Court *qua* the present petitioner shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.
8. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court *forthwith*.
9. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned learned Trial Court for necessary information and compliance.

AMIT SHARMA, J

JANUARY 16, 2025/bsr

Click here to check corrigendum, if any