



\$~30

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

+ **LPA 647/2023**

**PAWAN KUMAR GOEL**

..... Appellant

Through: Mr Nalin Kohli with Mr Vivek  
Ranjan Tiwary, Mr Sajan Shankar  
Prasad, Ms Radhika Pareva, Mr  
Anshul Malik and Mr Vagish Pandey,  
Advocates.

versus

**DR. DHAN SINGH & ANR.**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Vaibhav Vutts with Ms Aamna  
hasan and Ms Anupriya, Advocates.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

**HON'BLE MR JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL**

**ORDER**

**10.05.2024**

%

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

**CM APPL. 48913/2023**

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

**LPA 647/2023 and CM APPL. 12907/2024**

2. After some arguments, Mr Nalin Kohli, learned counsel, who appears on behalf of the appellant, on instructions, says that he would like to confine the appellant's grievance to the cost imposed by the learned Single Judge while dismissing the application preferred by the appellant under Section 340 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1974.

3. Counsel for the respondents says that he would have no objection if

*LPA 647/2023*

*page 1 of 2*



the direction concerning imposition of cost contained in the impugned judgment is waived.

4. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed to the extent that the direction with regard to imposition of cost *qua* the appellant embedded in the impugned judgment shall stand excised.

5. Consequently, the pending application also stands closed.

**RAJIV SHAKDHER, J**

**AMIT BANSAL, J**

**MAY 10, 2024/tr**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*

*LPA 647/2023*

*page 2 of 2*