



\$~87

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **CRL.M.C. 9406/2024 CRL.M.A. 36065/2024 CRL.M.A. 36066/2024**  
**TILAK RAJ SACHDEVA** .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Mr. Inderjeet  
Prabhakaran M and Mr. Anubhav  
Garg, Advocates.

versus

**RAVIN DUTTA** .....Respondent  
Through:

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL**

**ORDER**  
**02.12.2024**

%

1. This petition has been filed seeking setting aside the impugned order dated 06<sup>th</sup> November 2024, passed by JMFC (NI Act- 06) South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi in CT Case no. 472759/2016. An application had been filed under Section 313(1)(b) Cr.P.C stating that in the recording of the statement of accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2018, a collective blanket question was put forward by the MM in following form, *“All the incriminating evidence have been put to the accused and he has been asked to explain if he wants to say anything in his defence”*
2. To this, response of the accused has been specific on each aspect of the incriminating evidence.
3. Counsel for petitioner stated that they are worried that subsequently, an objection may not be taken by the accused that specific questions were not put to him.



4. On this basis, an application was moved which was dismissed by the impugned order.
5. It is noted that, the accused was present when the impugned order was passed on 06<sup>th</sup> November 2024 and did not raise any issue relating to the specific circumstances and allegations being put to him, while his statement was recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. While the style and the manner of the question put the accused while recording of Section 313 Cr.P.C., statement may be an issue, counsel for petitioner also agrees that the responses given by accused in his statement, were specific and he responded to each of the incriminating evidences.
6. In this view of the matter, there will be no purpose in subverting the trial which has already progressed and is at the stage of final arguments.
7. Considering that the accused has not raised any issue, it is clarified that the lack of specific questions put to the accused while recording of the statement under section 313 Cr PC, cannot be a ground that can be taken by the accused at a later stage.
8. Accordingly, petition is disposed of with the above observations.
9. 'dasti'
10. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

**ANISH DAYAL, J**

**DECEMBER 2, 2024/RK/kp**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*