



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 587/2024, CRL.M.A. 5382/2024**

SANJAY KAPUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shakti Mann, Advocate.

versus

STATE AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, ASC for
State with Mr. Abhijeet Kumar and
Mr. Sagar Mehlawat, Advocates
alongwith ASI Faiyaz Ahmad, P.S.
Sarita Vihar.
Mr. Gaurav Kakar, Advocate for
complainant/respondent No.2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

18.07.2024

%

1. By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 0622/2023 registered under Sections 386/419/420 IPC at P.S. Sarita Vihar primarily on the ground that allegations made in the complaint are patently false, inasmuch as, though the complainant has stated that the petitioner has held himself out as a lawyer, the same is not borne out from any material on the record. He submits that the petitioner was only a director of Legal Syndicate Advisory Pvt. Ltd. He also contends that earlier an application was filed under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. on behalf of the complainant, wherein a closure report was filed which supports that no case is made against the petitioner.



2. The petition is vehemently resisted by Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, learned ASC for State and learned counsel for the complainant. They both, on instructions, state that at no point of time any application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. seeking registration of FIR was ever filed before the Magistrate. Learned ASC for the State, on instructions from SI Fayaz Ahmad, categorically denies the contention about the filing of any closure report.
3. Learned counsel for the complainant clarifies that only an application was filed before Id. MM for monitoring of the investigation.
4. Learned ASC for the State further submits that the petitioner has a Twitter account in which he is, in fact, holding himself as a lawyer and a director of law firm. It is submitted that during investigation, it has come on record that money has been transferred through banking channels to the account of the present petitioner. The Counsel further submits that during investigation, no material has come on record that indicates that either petitioner has a LLB decree or is enrolled as a lawyer.
5. In view of the above, I find no ground in the present petition, consequently, the same is dismissed alongwith pending application.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

JULY 18, 2024

ga