



\$~49

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

+ **CRL.A. 955/2016**

CHANDER PAL SINGH VIMAL

..... Appellant

Represented by: Mr. Harsh K. Sharma, Ms. Vaibhavi Sharma, Mr. Rohit Gaur, Mr. Pulkit Jain and Mr. Vivek Punia, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Philomon Kani, Ms. Kriti Handa, Ms. Hansika Sahu and Ms. Damini K., Advocates for Ms. Rajdipa Behura, SPP for CBI with Insp. Arjun Singh.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

% **03.04.2018**

Crl.M.A. No. 4895/2018

The appellant/applicant has preferred the present appeal challenging his conviction for offence punishable under Section 13(2) r/w 13(1)(e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (in short PC Act).

By the present application, appellant submits that the properties of the appellant attached by the learned Trial Court exceeds much beyond the disproportionate assets calculated against the appellant. Thus, after the

CRL.A. 955/2016

page 1 of 2



conclusion of trial the appellant filed an application before the learned Trial Court seeking release of the properties which were beyond the disproportionate assets. The trial Court record is thus required by the learned Trial Court to decide the said application.

Learned proxy counsel for the learned SPP on instruction states that the CBI has no objection if Trial Court record be sent back.

Considering that the application filed by the appellant is required to be decided by the learned Trial Court, registry is directed to send the Trial Court record back after scanning the same to the Trial Court who would return back the Trial Court record within the period of three months to this Court from the date of receipt.

Application is disposed of.

Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

APRIL 03, 2018

‘yo’

CRL.A. 955/2016

page 2 of 2