



\$~73

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.REV.P. 882/2023, CRL.M.A. 22879/2023 &
CRL.M.A. 22880/2023

CBIPetitioner
Through: Mr. Ravi Sharma, SPP
with Mr. Swapnil
Choudhary, Mr. Ishann
Bhardwaj & Ms.
Madhulika Rai Sharma,
Advocates.

versus

M.LOGAPATHI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. R.K. Handoo,
Advocate (Through V.C.).
Mr. Mayank Sharma, Mr.
Parkash Goyal, Mr. Ketan
Kumar Roy, Mr. Shekhar
Pathak & Ms. Barkha
Rastogi, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

% **ORDER**
06.12.2024

1. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that concededly the impugned order was passed by the learned Trial Court in an application dated 11.12.2017 which was filed seeking the mirror image of interception and the copy of the hard disk.
2. Looking at the prayers made by the respondent, the application can safely be assumed to have been filed under Section 207 of the CrPC.
3. He submits that the learned Trial Court, though denied the prayers as sought by the respondent, however, proceeded to pass



certain observations in regard to the admissibility of the evidence.

4. He submits that the learned Trial Court exceeded its jurisdiction.

5. He further vehemently contends that in terms of Section 207 of the CrPC, the remit of the learned Trial Court is only to the extent of deciding whether the document or the material sought by the accused is to be supplied or not.

6. He submits that the learned Trial Court, at that stage, cannot comment on the validity or the admissibility or the evidence which has to be decided at the time of final arguments after the evidence is laid.

7. Mr. R.K. Handoo, Advocate seeks time to address arguments.

8. List on 23.01.2025.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 6, 2024

'Aman'