



\$~78

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 2305/2024**
RAHUL MAGANPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in-person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC for the
State with SI Sumit, P.S.: Subzi
Mandi.
Mr. Jasmeet Singh Rekhi, Advocate
for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **23.03.2026**

W.P.(CRL) 2305/2024

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') read with Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner seeks quashing of case FIR No. 257/2024 dated 28.05.2024 registered under section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at P.S.: Subzi Mandi, North District, Delhi.

CRL.M.A. 8774/2026

2. By way of the present application filed under section 528 of the BNSS, the applicant/petitioner, who appears in-person and claims to be an Advocate, seeks the following relief:

"1. Applicant ("Advocate Rahul Magan") respectfully requests that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi approve the Memo of Parties amendment in light of the aforementioned facts and circumstances."



3. A perusal of the proposed amended memo of parties shows that the applicant has sought to implead the Commissioner of Police, Delhi; the Ex-DCP, West District; the DCP, North District; the Director of Prosecution; as well as the DCP, West District in the present matter, in addition to the complainant, who is his sister-in-law.
4. Considering that the application alongwith its annexures runs into about 250 pages, including judgments relied-upon by the petitioner, the court has given to the petitioner a patient hearing.
5. In the course of hearing however, the court is unable to discern any cogent basis for the petitioner to have impleaded 04 members of the Police Commissionerate, including the Police Commissioner, who is an officer who was not even holding that office at the time when the subject FIR was registered. In the application, the petitioner has also named counsel who were representing the State in the present proceedings. Vague and generalised allegations have been levelled against all the said persons.
6. Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, learned ASC appears for the State on advance copy; and submits that the wanton and indiscriminate nature of allegations levelled by the petitioner calls for strictaction at the hands of this court.
7. Mr. Jasmeet Singh Rekhi, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 (sister-in-law) contends that the petitioner is not even a duly enrolled Advocate.
8. At the end of the hearing, on the court's inquiry, the petitioner submits that he is being "*victimised by the system*". Since this court is unable to discern any specific or cogent basis to that conclusion; and in order to



not consume any further judicial time on the present matter, the petitioner is directed to give a short synopsis of his submissions on the present application, alongwith a list of judicial precedents he seeks to rely upon in support of his submissions, not exceeding 05 pages; with copy to the opposing counsel.

9. Let the needful be done before the next date.
10. Re-notify on 18th August 2026, the date already fixed.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MARCH 23, 2026

ds