



\$~38

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2722/2022**

SUNIL GOEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohit Mathur, Senior
Advocate with Mr.
Shailesh Chandra Jha, Mr.
Vignesh and Mr. Mayank
Sharma, Advs.

versus

STATE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari,
ASC for the State with Mr.
Alok Sharma, Adv. with
Insp. N.K. Singh, EOW.
Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj,
SPP for CBI with Mr.
Kushagra Kumar, Mr.
Amit Kumar Rana and Mr.
Abhishek Ranjan Singh,
Advs. for CBI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

12.09.2025

1. There has been some confusion which has been persisting for the last many years in regard to certain documents, which the petitioner claims, were summoned by the prosecution from the Income Tax Department and which are essential for the purpose of prosecuting the accused persons, however, have been misplaced by the prosecution.
2. Certain orders passed by the learned Trial Court have been shown to this Court where the Investigating Officer admits that certain documents were seized but actually are not on record.
3. The learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State,



however, submits that the said documents are at Page Nos. 142, 155 and 734 of the Chargesheet.

4. The said fact is disputed by Mr. Mohit Mathur, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the inspection of the record has been carried out on number of occasions, however, the said documents are the original partnership deed dated 09.09.1997, 01.04.2002 and 01.04.2004 and the documents mentioned in Paragraph 19 of the present petition.

5. The petitioner claims that the partnership deed of the year 2002 is forged which was filed along with the balance sheet by the accused partners for the financial year ending on 31.03.2003.

6. Making the aforesaid submissions, the petitioner seriously apprehends that the Investigating Officer at that time was hand in glove with the accused persons, which has led to the documents being lost to benefit the accused persons and, thus, seeks the investigation to be transferred to the Central Bureau of Investigation.

7. Since the prosecution claims that the said documents are on record, let a copy of the trial court record be produced before this Court in digitized form for perusal and further orders.

8. The parties are permitted to inspect the digitized record before the next date of hearing.

9. List on 03.11.2025.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 12, 2025

'KDK'