



\$~23 & 24

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2649/2010 & CRL.M.A. 13880/2010,
CRL.M.A. 13881/2010, CRL.M.A. 10625/2013

ANUP KAUR & ORSPetitioners

Through: Ms. Katyayni Vajpayee,
Advocate (through VC).

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP for
the State with SI Sunila
Gahlot, PS Safdarjung
Enclave.

Dr. Sarbjit Sharma and
Ms. Laxmi Sharma,
Advocates for R-2.

+ CRL.M.C. 3042/2010 & CRL.M.A. 10650/2013

RVS BHULLARPetitioner

Through: Ms. Padma Priya, Mr.
Varhit Vashistha, Ms.
Anindita Sharma Pujari,
Ms. Poornima Gupta, Mr.
Sparsh Saxena, Advocates.

versus

STATE & ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP for
the State with SI Sunila
Gahlot, PS Safdarjung
Enclave.

Dr. Sarbjit Sharma and
Ms. Laxmi Sharma,
Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

29.10.2025



CRL.M.A. 19560/2025 in CRL.M.C. 3042/2010

1. The applicants seek impleadment on behalf of respondent no.2/ Shri Baldev Singh Sehgal, who is stated to have expired on 06.03.2025. The applicants are the legal representatives of respondent no.2.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner, however, objects to such impleadment stating that in the criminal proceedings the complainant has no role and the arguments have to be addressed by the prosecution.
3. Undisputedly, the role of the complainant is limited in the criminal proceedings. The complainants are allowed to address arguments only in support of the arguments advanced by the learned prosecutor and the complainant has no independent right of being heard when the case has been duly prosecuted by the prosecution. However, concededly in terms of Section 339 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 the Courts can permit any person to prosecute the accused persons. The interest of the complainant in the prosecution cannot be denied.
4. Even otherwise, the accused has filed the present petition seeking quashing of the proceedings emanating from the complaint filed by Respondent no.2 and has also specifically impleaded complainant as respondent no.2. Thus, impleadment of the legal representatives after the demise of Respondent No. 2 cannot be denied.
5. The objection raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is, therefore, meritless.
6. In view of the above, the present application is allowed.
7. The applicants are impleaded as respondents in the present petition. Amended memo of parties filed along with the **CRL.M.C. 2649/2010 & CRL.M.C. 3042/2010**



application is taken on record.

CRL.M.C. 2649/2010 & CRL.M.A. 13880/2010, CRL.M.A. 13881/2010, CRL.M.A. 10625/2013, CRL.M.A. 19075/2025 and CRL.M.C. 3042/2010 & CRL.M.A. 10650/2013

8. The learned proxy counsel for the petitioner in CRL.M.C. 2649/2010 and the learned proxy counsel for the complainant in CRL.M.C. 3042/2010, request for adjournment.

9. At their request, list on 27.01.2026.

10. The parties are at liberty to file their short note of arguments before the next date of hearing.

11. A copy of this order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 29, 2025

DU