

  
**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN**  
**BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 4883/2023

Shri Gyanesh Chaudhary S/o Shri Hari Krishna Choudhary,  
-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan  
-----Respondent

Connected With

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 2876/2024  
Rajesh Sharma Son Of Shri Gokul Chand Sharma,  
-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan  
-----Respondent

---

|                   |   |                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner(s) | : | Mr. Pankaj Gupta with<br>Mr. Chinmay Sharma                                                                                                 |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. Amit Punia, PP<br>Mr. Praveen Balwada with<br>Mr. Mohit Balwada,<br>Mr. Aditya Raj,<br>Mr. Sunil Shekhawat and<br>Mr. Lavkesh Bhambhani |

---

**JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND**

**Order**

**04/11/2025**

1. This Court vide order dated 26.09.2025 passed the following order:

“It has been pointed out by counsel for complainant that due grant of interim protection to the accused-petitioner vide order dated 08.08.2023 in FIR No. 80/2022, he is not cooperating with the investigation and investigation has not been proceeded.

It is hereby observed that let investigation be continued and progress report of investigation be filed before this Court, although, interim protection dated 08.08.2023 shall remain

continue, but subject to cooperation with the investigation agency by the petitioner.

Learned Public Prosecutor is directed to call for the progress report of investigation.

List these matters on 04.11.2025.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the aforesaid order, a letter was sent to the Investigating Officer on 15.10.2025 indicating therein that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the Investigating Officer and the authorized representative of the company, the whole time Director and the President Corporate of the petitioner company, Mr. Krishna Kumar, would appear with the relevant documents before the Investigating Officer. Counsel submits that in-spite of above, he was not allowed to appear for the purpose of interrogation.

3. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor as well as counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submitted that in-spite of repeated reminders, the petitioner has failed to appear for the purpose of investigation.

4. Heard and considered the submissions made at the Bar and perused the material available on the record.

5. The Investigating Officer may allow the authorized representative of the petitioner Mr. Krishna Kumar to appear before him for the purpose of investigation on 19.11.2025 and even if after investigation, the Investigating Officer is of the view that interrogation/investigation from the petitioner No.1 is required, then the petitioner be allowed to appear through Video Conferencing for the purpose of investigation by fixing a particular date.

6. List on 26.11.2025.



[CRLMP-4883/2023]

7. Interim order, if any, to continue till then.
8. Public Prosecutor is directed to call for the report of the investigation conducted pursuant to the order.

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J

KUD/7-8