



\$~17

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

+ CRL.A. 356/2016

SUNIL @ SUNIL SHARMA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Madhav Khurana,
Senior Advocate with Mr.
Amit Dwivedi, Mr. Adarsh
Priyadarshi, Mr. Shaurya
Singh and Mr. Apoorva
Shankar, Advocates.
Petitioner in person.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF
REVENUE INTELLIGENCE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satish Aggarwala,
Senior Standing Counsel.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

14.07.2025

CRL.M.A. 6735/2024 (for initiating action against the appellant)

1. This present application is filed by the respondent/Directorate of Revenue Intelligence for initiating action against the appellant.

2. It is not clear from the prayer in the application as to what action is sought by the respondent department against the appellant.

3. However, it is essentially the case of the respondent department that a forged document was submitted before this Court by the appellant in order to obtain a favourable order. It is alleged that the fabricated document, which was filed before this Court, persuaded this Court to release the appellant on custody parole by order dated 01.08.2023.

CRL.A. 356/2016

Page 1 of 4



4. The learned senior ~~senior~~ counsel for the respondent department states that the letter dated 12.09.2023, issued by the Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi, (**'RML Hospital'**), clearly shows that the laboratory report of blood test which was filed by the appellant in support of his application seeking interim suspension of sentence was fabricated since no blood sample was received in the laboratory.

5. The learned senior counsel for the appellant submits that at the time of filing of application for interim suspension of sentence, the appellant was in custody, and therefore, no allegation can be made in regard to him forging any document.

6. He submits that such documents were provided by the mother of the appellant and the Hospital is trying to fasten the responsibility on the patient. He further submits that it is undisputed that the mother of the appellant had been visiting the Hospital for the purpose of treatment.

7. He submits that the purported forged report is only a blood report, which also mentions in the last column that the report verification is pending. He submits that the appellant, even otherwise, could not have availed any benefit from the same, and therefore, no intention can be attributed to the mother of the appellant for fabricating such documents.

8. He submits that the RML Hospital is a government hospital and there is a possibility that they may have lost certain data for which the responsibility is now sought to be fastened on the mother of the appellant.

9. By order dated 01.08.2023, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court granted custody parole to the appellant on the ground that the surgery of the appellant's mother is to be conducted for removal of stones from the gall bladder. It was contended on



behalf of the respondent department that the RML Hospital was not co-operating for the purpose of verification of the documents. It was, however, not the case of the respondent that the surgery was not required.

10. A bare perusal of the said order indicates that the Predecessor Bench of this Court was persuaded to direct release of the appellant on custody parole for a period of 5 days, not because the documents filed by the appellant in support of his application were verified, but for the fact that Mr. Aggarwala, learned Senior Standing Counsel for the respondent had fairly submitted that if the Court is inclined to grant any indulgence, the appellant can be released in custody parole.

11. Thus, in view of the aforesaid discussion, considering that the appellant at the time of presentation of the purportedly fabricated document was in custody, and as no benefit has been taken by the appellant by taking support of the said document, which even otherwise appears to be inconsequential, in the opinion of this Court, no action is required to be initiated against the appellant.

12. It is also undisputed that the appellant had not misused the liberty.

13. The application is therefore dismissed.

CRL.M.A. 3844/2018 (for disposal of car seized by the respondent)

14. This application is filed by the respondent department for permission to dispose of the Honda Civic Car bearing No. DL-4CAH-1455.

15. The learned senior counsel for the appellant states that the appellant has no objection if the said car is disposed of.

16. In view of the above, the respondent department is



permitted to take steps for disposal of the Honda Civic Car bearing No. DL-4CAH-1455 as per the prescribed procedure.

17. The application stands allowed in the aforesaid terms.

CRL.A. 356/2016

18. List in due course.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 14, 2025

DU