



\$~79

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6434/2024, CRL.M.A.24599/2024 (for permission to file lengthy synopsis and list of dates), CRL.M.A. 24785/2024 (to file additional documents)

JIGNESH MEHTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Senior Advocate with Ms. Stuti Gujral, Ms. Priti Verma, Mr. Vishwajeet Singh Bhati, Mr. Devrishi Tyagi and Mr. Vipin Kumar, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONRespondent

Through: Mr. Anupam Sharma, SPP with Mr. Prakarsh Airan, Mr. Abhishek Batra, Mr. Ripudaman Sharma, Mr. Vashisht Rao and Mr. Syamantak Modgill, Advocates for CBI with IO Alok Kumar Singh.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

20.08.2024

CRL.M.A. 24598/2024 (Exemption) and CRL.M.A. 24786/2024 (Exemption)

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



CRL.M.C. 6434/2024

3. The Petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, has been filed on behalf of the accused No. 9 wherein the Order dated 13.08.2024 of learned ASJ, has been challenged to the extent that the accused persons including the petitioner, have been directed to file an affidavit of admission/denial of documents and also sought expungement of the observations made against the petitioner *vide* Order dated 12.07.2024 that the petitioner by moving an Application under Section 207 CrPC, is delaying the proceedings.

4. **Submissions heard.**

5. Insofar as, the admission/denial of documents under Section 294 is concerned, it has been rightly argued that this stage comes after the framing of Charge. Therefore, the admission/denial of documents may be deferred till after the framing of charge. The other expungement of remarks that is sought, is not justified.

6. Learned Senior Advocate has made a grievance of the observations made by the learned Special Judge (PC Act), in its Order dated 12.07.2024 wherein while considering the Application under Section 207 CrPC seeking illegible or missing deficient documents, had observed that this Application has been filed only on behalf of one accused and not on behalf of other accused persons making it a strange exception. Despite so, the Application of the accused No. 9, Jagnesh Mehta, has been allowed.

7. Learned Senior Advocate argues that after his Application under Section 207 CrPC, six other accused persons have filed similar applications. The objection is taken that apparently, the Application is intended to delay. Be that as it may, this was only in the context of allowing the application,



without there being any adverse impact.

8. No further clarifications are required. The Petition is disposed of along with the pending applications.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

AUGUST 20, 2024/RS