

\$~17

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9109/2017**

**SNEHA SAWAI**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abir Phukan, Ms. Anitha Mathai  
Muthirenthu and Ms. Sonali Jain,  
Advocates.

versus

**RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ORS**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. K.S. Parihar and Mr. Kuldeep S.  
Parihar, Advocates for R-1.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

**ORDER**

%

**01.05.2018**

**CM. APPL.39578/2017**

1. This is an application filed to seek review of the order dated 16.10.2017, passed by Hon'ble Ms. Justice Indermeet Kaur. Hon'ble Ms. Justice Indermeet Kaur has, since then, retired. It is the assertion of the petitioner that there are errors in the order dated 16.10.2017. It is contended in this behalf that certain factual assertions have not been correctly recorded.

2. According to the petitioner, it was her case before the Court that her husband, one, Mr. Anshul Jain had forged her signatures on the loan documents issued by respondent no.2 and based on the forged documents, moneys were remitted by respondent no.2 to the

petitioner's salary account.

3. The petitioner claims that these moneys were withdrawn by Mr. Anshul Jain and transferred to his own account.

3.1 In sum, the petitioner was aggrieved not only by the act of forgery but also by the fact that she could not be called upon to bear the burden of the liability owed to respondent no.2.

4. The petitioner claims that a criminal complaint was lodged, once, this aspect was discovered.

5. It is also the petitioner's case that contrary to what has been recorded in the order dated 16.10.2017, she never held an account with respondent no.2.

6. Mr. Parihar appears on behalf of respondent no.1/RBI.

7. There is, however, no representation on behalf of respondent no.2.

8. Given the aforementioned circumstances, the application is disposed of with the direction that the order dated 16.10.2017 will not come in the way of the criminal proceedings initiated by the petitioner or any other proceedings that she may take out against her husband i.e., Mr. Anshul Jain or, any other party.

9. This direction is not opposed by Mr. Parihar. Learned counsel informs me that pursuant to the order dated 16.10.2017, the petitioner's representation has been disposed of.

9.1 This fact is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner.

10. Needless to say, the concerned court would frame its own view with regard to the assertions made by the petitioner before it.

**RAJIV SHAKDHER, J**

**MAY 01, 2018/cks**