



\$~109

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3125/2024 & CRL.M.As. 12106-07/2024

BEENA RAIZADA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Trilok Nath Saxena, Dr. Shiv
Kumar Tiwari, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ravi Sharma, SPP for CBI with
Mr. Anjani Kumar Rai, Mr. Pradhull
Kumar and Ms. Madhulika Rai
Sharma, Advocates.
Mr. Siddharth Handa and Ms.
Shubhangi Arora, Advocates for
respondent No.2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

24.04.2024

%

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of the orders dated 03.06.2022 and 28.02.2024 passed by the learned CMM, Rouse Avenue Court, Central District, Delhi in Case No.CBI/15/2021 under Sections 417/511/468/471 and 477 of IPC titled CBI v. Beena Raizada in case arising out of FIR No.RCAC12018A0015 registered in CBI/AC-1/New Delhi.
2. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the decision in Jagjeet Singh v. Ashish Mishra, reported in (2022) 9 SCC 321.
3. From a perusal of the material placed on record, it appears that



initially a case being FIR No. RCAC12018A0015 was registered in CBI/AC-1/New Delhi on 12.11.2018. The case was registered under Section 417/511/468/471 and 477 IPC against the present petitioner. On investigation, a closure report was filed. The respondent No.2 preferred a protest petition on which further investigation was directed under Section 173(8) Cr.P.C. Thereafter a supplementary police report under Section 173 Cr.P.C came to be filed, where on the basis of further investigation, again no case was found to be made out against the present petitioner. The notice of the supplementary report was issued to the respondent No.2 and he was apprised of the case. Although vide the impugned order, the concerned Court had given the liberty to file a protest petition, the same is yet to be filed.

4. Pertinently, at the time of filing of the first protest petition which was entertained, no challenge was made by the petitioner to the same.

5. Considering the fact that the instant petition is premature, I find no ground to entertain the petition and the same is accordingly dismissed along with pending applications.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

APRIL 24, 2024/rd