

\$~11

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

+ CRL.REV.P. 265/2018

ULHAS KHAIRE @ LOKESHWAR DEV Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kumar Vaibhav, Advocate

Versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC for
respondent UOI with Mr. Randeep
Sachdeva, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

14.05.2019

%

Trial court vide impugned order of 16th October, 2017, has declined petitioner's application under Section 91 Cr.P.C. seeking production of record from the bank.

Upon hearing and on perusal of impugned order, I find that petitioner in the application of 18th August, 2017 has not categorically stated as to what document and of what period and from which bank are sought. Finding petitioner's application under Section 91 Cr.P.C. to be vague, the trial court has rightly dismissed it. However, in the facts and circumstances of this case, it is deemed appropriate to permit petitioner to file another application under Section 91 Cr.P.C. before the trial court with complete particulars within a period of three weeks. If it is so done, then the trial court shall consider the said application and pass a speaking

order thereon.

With aforesaid observations, this petition is accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MAY 14, 2019
r