



\$~9

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

+ CRL.M.C. 5440/2024

M/S HIGHCO ENGINEERS PVT. LTD .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Sharma,  
Mr. Manoj Rajpoor & Mr.  
Dushyant Sharma, Advs.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman  
Bhardwaj, SPP with ASP  
GM Rathi

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN**

**ORDER**

%

**23.07.2024**

**CRL.M.A. 20825/2024 (for exemption)**

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

**CRL.M.C. 5440/2024 & CRL.M.A. 20824/2024 (seeking ex parte stay)**

3. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. RC2192022E0003 dated 30.03.2022 under Section 120B read with Section 406, 411, 421, 468, 471 and 477-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 13(2) read with 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner company has been unnecessarily implicated in the present case and has been shown as one of the accused.
5. He submits that the only allegation which are made against

**CRL.M.C. 5440/2024**

**Page 1 of 3**



the petitioner is that certain amount was transferred by the accused company for supplying of machineries whereas no machinery was ever supplied.

6. He submits that the records clearly indicate that no amount was ever transferred to the petitioner by the accused company, namely, M/s Allied Strips Limited. He submits that the record/documents have already been produced before the Central Bureau of Investigation ('CBI'), however, the investigation is pending from the last more than two years.

7. He submits that the applicant is a well-known company engaged in supply of sheets and the pendency of FIR is causing unnecessary harassment and prejudice in regard to the work orders that the petitioner would seek from the Government Departments.

8. Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI submits that the investigation has almost concluded. He submits that an appropriate report would be filed before the concerned Court within a period of three to four months. He fairly submits that, at this stage, no evidence has been found against the petitioner.

9. He further submits that the allegations have been made against the petitioner which raises a suspicion as to its involvement in the alleged offence and, for that reason, the petitioner has been named as one of the accused in Column No. 7.

10. Considering that no evidence has been found at this stage against the petitioner and the chargesheet is likely to be filed within a period of three to four months, this Court does not consider it apposite to entertain the present petition at this stage.

11. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the



Court in future in case the grievance remains.

12. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

**AMIT MAHAJAN, J**

**JULY 23, 2024**

**“SS”**