



\$~98

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 2332/2024, CRL.M.A. 8964/2024, CRL.M.A. 8965/2024

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC for State
with Ms. Anvita Bhandari, Mr. Kunal
Mittal, Mr. Arjit Sharma and Mr.
Vaibhav Vats, Advocates alongwith
SI Shalini Tondon, Social Media Cell.

versus

KUSHAGRA PATHAK

..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

21.03.2024

%

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. read with Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner is aggrieved by the directions contained in paragraph 69 to 80 of the impugned order dated 15.02.2024 whereby learned Sessions Court has discharged the accused.
2. Mr. Bhandari, learned ASC for the State/petitioner submits that while passing the impugned order, learned Sessions Court had also directed the Commissioner of Police to hold inquiry and fix the liability as in the opinion of the Sessions Court, the material filed along with the charge-sheet was not duly appreciated. Learned ASC further states that petitioner is in the process of challenging the impugned order on merits. Insofar as, petitioner's grievance with respect to observation in paragraph 69 to 80 are concerned, learned ASC, on instructions, submits that under the directions of



Commissioner of Police, an inquiry was duly conducted by ACP, P.G. Cell and no lapse has been found in the same.

3. Considering the aforesaid and the fact that the State is in the process of assailing the impugned order on discharge, no further order is required to be passed in the present petition and the same is dismissed alongwith miscellaneous applications.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MARCH 21, 2024

ga