



\$~41

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 2199/2020 & CRL.M.A.1003/2021**

BALINDER YADAVPetitioner
Through: Mr. Rajeev Sharma, advocate.

versus

SUNIL KUMAR SANGWANRespondent
Through: Mr. Prag chawla, Ms. Jaspreet kaur
and Ms. Muskan Aggarwal,
Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER
11.09.2024

%

1. Petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C has been filed challenging the Order dated 04.03.2020 passed in Complaint Case No.23112/2016 titled "Sunil Kumar Sangwan vs. Balinder Yadav" whereby the Application filed under Section 311 Cr.P.C on behalf of the Respondent/Complainant for placing on record the Promissory Note of 2012 which he has found recently while going through his old documents, to be placed on record and complainant be permitted for his further re-examination, has been allowed.

2. The learned counsel for the revisionist submits that this promissory note was not on record and there was no mention of this promissory note ever by the complainant at any stage. It is only after the evidence of the petitioner/accused had been closed, that this application seeking permission to place promissory note on record



was filed.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent/complainant submits that this revision may be allowed and the application under Section 311 Cr.P.C which had been filed may be dismissed.

4. **Submissions Heard.**

5. As conceded by learned counsel on behalf of the Complainant, the Revision is allowed. The impugned Order dated 04.03.2020 allowing the Application under Section 311 Cr.P.C of the complainant, is hereby set aside.

6. Revision Petition is disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

SEPTEMBER 11, 2024

rk