



\$~10

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

+ W.P.(C) 8833/2018 & CM APPLs. 33964/2018, 34891/2022,  
14712/2023, 54157/2023

SH. VIJAY DEV DABAS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. V.P. Rana and Mr. Bhuvan  
Tomar, Advocates.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avni Singh, Panel Counsel for  
GNCTD.

Respondent No. 3 (in-Person).

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

**28.01.2026**

%

1. The Petitioner impugns the order dated 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2016, passed by the office of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Narela. The said order also finds reference in the decision rendered by this Court in CRL.M.C. 4459/2022, wherein, on a petition preferred by the present Petitioner, FIR No. 605/2021, which had emanated from a private complaint filed by Ms. Poonam Dabas, was quashed. The relevant extract from the said decision reads as under:

*“5. On 16.06.2016, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate (SDM), Narela, passed an order directing the registration of an FIR against the petitioner under Sections 193/199 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'), and a communication to this effect was sent to the SHO, Police Station Bawana. However, the SHO declined to register an FIR, stating that the offences were non-cognizable.*

*6. Respondent No. 2 then filed a complaint under Section 200 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate ('MM'), Rohini Courts, Delhi alleging that the petitioner had filed false affidavit before the Revenue Assistant and had*



*committed offences punishable under Sections 193/199 of the IPC. The learned MM, by order dated 31.07.2021 directed the police to register an FIR and sought for compliance report. Based on this direction, FIR No. 605/2021 was registered on 06.08.2021.*

*7. The investigation was concluded, and a final report under Section 173 of the CrPC was filed, following which the learned MM took cognizance of the alleged offences and issued summons to the petitioner. Aggrieved by the registration of the FIR and subsequent proceedings, the petitioner filed a revision petition before the learned Sessions Court, which was dismissed by order dated 31.05.2023 holding that direction to register an FIR on a private complaint by the Magistrate is contrary to the procedure laid down under Section 340 of the CrPC. However, the learned Sessions Court declined to set aside the order dated 31.07.2021 on the ground that FIR has already been registered and cognizance has been taken which is the subject matter before the High Court.”*

2. Since the aforesaid directions are presently under challenge before the Supreme Court in SLP No. 17149/2025, in the opinion of the Court, the present proceedings ought to be deferred, awaiting the outcome of the said proceedings.

3. Renotify on 13<sup>th</sup> May, 2026.

**SANJEEV NARULA, J**

**JANUARY 28, 2026**

as