



\$~19

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3405/2024, CRL.M.A. 13083/2024 (for interim direction)

BRAHM SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Counsel for petitioner (appearance
not given)

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for
the State with SI Sachin Panwar, PS
Fatehpur Beri.

Mr. Rishab Raj Jain, Standing
Counsel with Mr.Raghav Awasthi,
Advocates for R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

20.09.2024

CRL.M.C. 3405/2024

1. The Petition under Section 482 of CrPC has been filed on behalf of the petitioner for quashing of Order dated 01.08.2023 wherein bailable warrants have been issued against the petitioner in the sum of Rs.5,000/- with one surety of the like amount.
2. The basic grievance is that the person found at the premises had disclosed his name as Brahm Singh s/o Ram Lal but in fact the petitioner/accused is Ravi s/o Ram Lal. It is evident that the person found was by the name of Brahm Singh and not the petitioner. However, in the impugned Order dated 01.08.2023, it is categorically observed that the



videograph of the scene of incident clearly discloses that it is the petitioner, who was found available on the spot, at the time of inspection. Incidentally, the name of the father is the same for the complainant and the alleged Brahm Singh. It is *prima facie* evident as has been rightly observed that it is the same person. It is evident that the petitioner has given his name incorrectly, at the time of inspection.

3. There is no infirmity in the impugned Order dated 01.08.2023. Moreover, the trial has already proceeded and Notice under Section 251 has been framed against the petitioner, there is no merit in the present Petition, which is hereby dismissed.

4. The Petition is disposed of accordingly. The pending application also stands disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

SEPTEMBER 20, 2024/RS