



\$~64

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 588/2025 & CRL.M.A. 5039/2025**

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Ms. Sanskriti,
Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for the State
SI Kamlesh, P.S. Bawana

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

17.02.2025

1. This is an application filed by the Petitioner seeking correction of the submission of the Petitioner recorded at paragraph 5 of the order dated 30.01.2025.
2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that Petitioner herein was never made a party to in CONT.CAS(C) 291/2003 and to this extent his submission recorded in the order be corrected; as it may cause prejudice.
3. Issue notice. Learned APP accepts notice.
4. A perusal of the order shows that inadvertently there are also typographical errors in this order. Moreover, considering that the Petitioner is merely seeking to correct his submission, which is also borne out from the record, the prayer sought in the application can be allowed.
5. Accordingly, the application is allowed and in addition to the



submission of the Petitioner, the typographical errors noted by this Court are corrected at paragraphs 4, 5, 8, 10 and 16. The corrections have been highlighted in bold.

“\$~46

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

+ CRL.M.C. 588/2025 & CRL.M.A. 2835/2025

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Ms. Sanskriti,
Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for the State
SI Kamlesh, P.S. Bawana

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

30.01.2025

1. This is a writ petition filed seeking the following reliefs: -

Quash the F.I.R. No. 92/2016 dated 13.02.2016 under Section 420/468/471/43 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station: Bawana, Delhi, with all pending proceeding emanating therefrom, including Charge Sheet qua the Petitioner herein.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that Petitioner while acting in discharge of his official duties as a Tehsildar processed a mutation application for agricultural land [bearing Khasra no. 154/718 (2-2) in the revenue estate of village Pooth Khurd] filed by legal heirs of one Mr. Yoginder Singh.

3. He states that simultaneously the said legal heirs of Mr. Yoginder Singh also filed an application seeking correction in the revenue records claiming that the status quo order dated 15.02.2005 issued by the Delhi High Court in Contempt Case (C) no. 291/2003 did not apply to the land in question.



4. He states that on the **basis of** official reports submitted to him by Halqa Patwari and Field Kanungo which also confirmed that the entry of status quo order in the revenue records was erroneous, the Petitioner ordered its removal and proceeded with the mutation process vide Order dated 08.05.2008.

5. He states that Petitioner was **never** made a party in CONT.CAS(C) 291/2003 filed by the complainant before the Delhi High Court and the said contempt petition was disposed of by the High Court vide Order dated 04.09.2008 and there was no adverse finding returned against the Petitioner herein.

6. He states however in the year 2016 one Mr. Randhir Singh filed a complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C before the learned ACMM, Rohini Courts, Delhi, alleging violation of the status quo order. He states acting on the said complaint the FIR No. 92/2016 was registered against the private parties as well as the Petitioner herein and the Halqa Patwari.

7. He states that in the action taken reports ('ATRs') filed by the Police in 2019 and 2020, the reports stated that there is no incriminating evidence found against the Petitioner.

8. He states however, the Petitioner who was due to superannuate on 28.01.2021, due to the pendency of these criminal proceedings was placed under suspension citing contemplated disciplinary proceedings.

9. He states that mutation order dated 08.05.2008 was passed by the Petitioner in a quasi-judicial capacity. He states that Petitioner acted in due discharge of his official duties as per the records filed before him which included the reports of the subordinate officers and the affidavits of the applicant.

10. He states that aggrieved party i.e. the complainant had the remedy of filing an appeal before the revenue **assistant**; however, no appeal was filed.

11. He states that in these facts, the pendency of these proceedings is



causing great prejudice to the Petitioner herein who is now a retired officer.

12. He states that the charge-sheet was filed on 26.04.2022 before the Trial Court and the Petitioner herein has filed an application seeking discharge, however the said application has not been decided by the Trial Court as adjournments are being sought by one or the other accused. He states that the matter is next listed on 22.04.2025.

13. Issue notice. Learned APP accepts notice.

14. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that he would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Trial Court to hear and decide his application seeking discharge expeditiously.

15. This Court has considered the submissions of the Petitioner and perused the records.

16. Keeping in view of the fact that FIR pertain to 2016 and 9 years have elapsed and considering the fact that the pendency of the criminal proceedings is having an adverse fact on the release of the retiral dues and the terminal benefits of the Petitioner, this Court is the considered opinion that the Petitioner has made out a case for seeking a direction to the Trial Court for expeditious disposal of his application seeking discharge.

17. Accordingly, the learned Trial Court is requested to hear and decide the said application expeditiously and preferably within four (4) weeks from 22.04.2025, the date already fixed.

18. At this stage, learned counsel for the Petitioner states that the petition may be disposed of with the aforesaid directions reserving liberty to the Petitioner to approach this Court, if the application remains undecided.

19. Accordingly, with the aforesaid directions to the Trial Court the petition is disposed of along-with all pending applications; however, liberty is reserved to the Petitioner to avail his remedies in law in case he is aggrieved by the final order passed by the Trial Court on the application seeking discharge.

20. It is made clear that observation made in this order is not an



expression on the merits of the case.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J
JANUARY 30, 2025/mt/AKT

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)

6. In view of the aforesaid correction, it is hereby directed that the order dated 30.01.2025 shall be read along with this order.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J
FEBRUARY 17, 2025/hp/AKT

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)