

\$~4 to 6

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 23.05.2018

+ CRL.M.C. 894/2018 & Crl. M.A. 3317/2018

PUNEET JAIN

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR Respondents

+ CRL.M.C. 895/2018 & Crl. M.A. 3319/2018

PUNEET JAIN

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR Respondents

+ CRL.M.C. 896/2018 & Crl. M.A. 3321/2018

PUNEET JAIN

..... Petitioner

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Anup J. Bhambhani, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Setu Niket and Ms. Esha Mazumdar, Advs.

For the Respondent(s): Mr. Akshai Malik, Addl. PP for the State with Inspr. Vinay Kumar & ACP R.R. Khatana

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT
23.05.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 29.11.2017 and also seeks setting aside of the complaint/Kalandra No. 128/2017 under Section 175 IPC for alleged violation of directions given under Section 91 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.P.C.), in FIR No.06/2014 under Section 7/13(l)(d) Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, Police Station Vigilance Cell.
2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the TV Channel, for which the petitioner works, had conducted a sting operation with regard to some of the Officers of the Delhi Police. Consequent to the sting operation, after due sanction, an FIR was registered against some of the officers with regard to whom the TV Channel had aired the sting operation.
3. It is contended that notices under Section 91 Cr. P.C. were issued to the petitioner seeking certain information and records.
4. It is contended that, inter alia, what was sought, was the original devices, which were used for carrying out the sting operation as well as the address of one Mr Deepak Sharma, who had downloaded the sting footage from the original devices to the DVD, which was provided to the Police Authorities.

5. It is contended that insofar as the original devices are concerned, the said devices had also been used for carrying out sting operation with regard to Muzaffar Nagar riots and the original devices have been submitted to the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha and are still in their custody.

6. It is contended that since the original devices are not in the power and possession of the petitioner, the petitioner had informed the Investigating Officer the location of the devices. It is undertaken, under instructions, that as and when devices are returned, the same would be provided to the Investigating Officer.

7. Insofar as providing the address of Mr Deepak Sharma is concerned, it was informed to the Investigating Officer that Mr Deepak Sharma was no longer associated with the Channel and the Company did not have record of the ex-employees, who had left the Organization. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, however, without prejudice, submits that after the Kalandra was filed, the address of Deepak Sharma, as available in their records, was provided to the Investigating Officer on 20.12.2017.

8. Learned Addl. PP under instructions from the Investigating Officers – ACP R.R. Khatana and Inspr. Vinay Kumar, submits that the requisite information has been provided and no further information as off now is required.

9. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, submits that if any further information is called for, the same shall be provided.

10. In view of the fact that the requisite information has been provided and the cause for issuance of the Kalandra has already been redressed, no further action is called for on the subject Kalandra. Accordingly, complaint/Kalandra M. Crl. No. 129/2017 under Section 175 of the IPC is dropped and all the consequent proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

11. Order *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

MAY 23, 2018
'rs'

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J