



\$~22 & 23

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

CNR No. DLHC010859362025

+ W.P.(CRL) 3590/2025 and CRL.M.A. 32412/2025, CRL.M.A. 32413/2025

RAJEEV MUKUL & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ashim Shridhar with Ms. Maheen Khan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Akhil Mittal, SPC for UOI with Mr. Shyana Dass Pattnayak, Adv.

(23)

CNR No. DLHC010859372025

+ W.P.(CRL) 3591/2025 and CRL.M.A. 32414/2025, CRL.M.A. 32415/2025

RAJEEV MUKUL & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ashim Shridhar with Ms. Maheen Khan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Akhil Mittal, SPC for UOI with Mr. Shyana Dass Pattnayak, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV



%

ORDER
24.08.2026

CRL.M.A. 32413/2025 in W.P.(CRL) 3590/2025

CRL.M.A. 32415/2025 in W.P.(CRL) 3591/2025

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 3590/2025 in CRL.M.A. 32412/2025

W.P.(CRL) 3591/2025 in CRL.M.A. 32414/2025

3. W.P.(CRL) 3590/2025 has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

“Quash the impugned summoning order dated 07.12.2015 passed by the Ld. MM-01, North-West District, Rohini Court, Delhi in CC No. 16/4, titled “UOI vs. M/s Zee Laboratories & Ors.” and all subsequent and consequential proceedings emanating therefrom;”

4. W.P.(CRL) 3591/2025 has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

“Quash the impugned summoning order dated 07.12.2015 passed by the Ld. MM-01, North-West District, Rohini Court, Delhi in CC No.15/4 titled “UOI vs. M/s Zee Laboratories & Ors.” and all subsequent and consequential proceedings emanating therefrom;”

5. The Court in earlier round of litigation at the instance of the Company in terms of paragraph 74 of the decision dated 27.06.2025 in W.P.(CRL) 3588/2016 & W.P.(CRL) 3592/2016 has rendered the following finding:

“74. In the present case, though this contention may have some merit, but considering that the present Petition has been filed only by the firm M/s. Zee Laboratories through an authorized representative and not by the Partners, this aspect cannot be considered, but is left open to be considered during the trial”



6. A fair reading of the aforesaid findings would indicate that the aspect whether the petitioners are entitled for the benefit as has been sought would be considered during the course of trial. This Court in coordinate combination would not venture into unsettling the said finding and therefore, is not inclined to entertain these petitions at the instance of the present petitioners. However, liberty has already been granted by the coordinate Bench in terms of paragraph 74 of the aforesaid to raise the issues and to seek for the benefit shall be dependent on the further course of the trial.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at this stage, submits that the present petitioners are exempted from their personal appearance till the charges are framed. According to him, if the Court is of the opinion that no material for framing of charges, the further trial shall dependent on the said adjudication otherwise the applicant will be discharged.

8. The said submissions seem to be reasonable.

9. Bearing in mind the fact that the complaint is pending for more than a decade and order of summon was passed in the year 2015, for the time being, the petitioners can be exempted from their personal appearance, however, the exemption shall be subject to further orders to be passed by the concerned Court on the applications filed by the petitioners. The petitioners, instead can be allowed to appear through video conferencing.

10. With these observations, the petitions stand disposed of. Pending applications stand disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

AUGUST 24, 2026/ab