



\$~84

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 9931/2024**

ANIL KUMAR SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Alamdar Hussain, Md. Sohail and
Mohd. Nazim Ansari, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State
with SI Arisal, PS: Vasant Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

% **18.12.2024**

CRL.M.A. 38050/2024 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exception.
2. Application is accordingly disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 9931/2024

1. This petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 84/2008 registered at P.S Vasant Vihar under sections 419/420/468/471/120B IPC. Subsequently, charge sheet has been filed under sections 419/420/468/471/174A/120B IPC.
2. Counsel for petitioner states that petitioner holds a diploma in General Medicine and was designated as a Physician with the title of Doctor of Medicine by Dugansh State Medical University, Republic of Kazakhstan, on 12th June 2003.
3. In order to practice in India, petitioner was required to undertake the screening test for Indian Nationals with Foreign Medical Qualification. He applied for the test, appeared in the examination on 30th March 2008 and, as



per him, passed the test.

4. On the day of the distribution of the certificates, the authorities refused to hand over the petitioner's certificate of examination on the allegation that someone else had impersonated the petitioner while giving the examination, leading to the registration of FIR. Petitioner was declared Proclaimed Offender in 2014. Thereafter, he was granted anticipatory bail *vide* order dated 13th February 2015, passed by the Sessions Court at Saket.

5. As per petitioner, since 2017, matter has been pending on the point of charge and is affecting his life, considering that, despite his medical qualification, he is unable to practice.

6. Issue notice.

7. Notice is accepted by State.

8. APP for State states on instructions, that the matter is fixed on 13th February 2025 before the Trial Court for arguments on charge and that the delay has been caused due to the absence of the accused.

9. Notwithstanding the respective contentions, considering the prolonged delay in the proceedings, the Trial Court is directed to proceed ahead with the arguments on charge on the date already fixed. No adjournment will be sought by counsel for the accused or the State on that day in order to facilitate the Trial Court in the proceedings.

10. Issue notice to the Respondent No. 2 on steps being taken by the petitioner through all permissible modes, including, email etc.

11. List on 28th February 2025.

12. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL,J

DECEMBER 18, 2024/RK/tk