



\$~34

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 4323/2025 & CRL.M.A. 38869/2025,
CRL.M.A. 38870/2025

RITESH KUMAR CHAUDHARYPetitioner

Through: Mr. Arvind Gupta, Mr. C.
Parkash, Mr. Shrey
Tanwar, Mr. Arun
Bhattacharya, Mr.
Abhishek Rana, Ms.
Anushree Rawat and Mr.
Ankit Verma, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari,
ASC for the State with Mr.
Alok Sharma, Advocate.
SI Jitender Singh, PS
Burari.
Mr. Gurmit Singh Hans,
Mr. Vishal Soni, Mr.
Gurman Dua and Ms.
Megha, Advocates for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **24.12.2025**

1. The present petition is filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No. 1135/2025 dated 10.12.2025, registered at police station Burari for the offences under Sections 329(3)/336(3)/338/340/61(2)(a)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS'), including the proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by the complainant alleging that the petitioner along with other accused



persons had tried to trespass into his property bearing khasra no. 529/1 situated in the area of village Burari, Delhi (**‘subject property’**).

3. The complainant claimed that he is the owner of the subject property having all the relevant documents. Complainant further claimed that the subject property is in his possession and he has also put his lock on the same. One electricity meter has also been installed.

4. It is further alleged that the petitioner made certain forged documents and has also filed a civil case which is also pending consideration before the Civil Court, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, in which an order of *status quo* has been passed.

5. It is further claimed that the petitioner along with two other persons on 07.08.2025 came to the subject property and tried to breakopen the lock.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even if the allegations are taken at the highest, the dispute is civil in nature for which the parties are litigating before the Civil Court. He submits that in the garb of the present FIR, the complainant has connived with the police officials and trying to take the possession of the subject property. He submits that the possession of the parties is the subject matter of demarcation which is being considered by the Civil Court.

7. The parties appear to have been litigating before the Civil Court in regard to the subject property. The learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, submits that *status quo* as on today is being maintained over the subject property.

8. Issue notice.

9. The learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State
W.P.(CRL) 4323/2025

Page 2 of 3



accepts notice.

10. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No. 2 accepts notice.

11. Let the status report/reply be filed by the respondents before the next date of hearing.

12. List on 03.03.2026.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 24, 2025

DU