



\$~14

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 556/2023**
M/S GRAYLINE SUPPLIES IMPEX (OPC) PVT. LTD.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aman Bidhuri, Advocate.
Mr. Deepesh Kataria, Advocate.
Mr. Shyam Lal, present (in-Person).

versus

THE STATE & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC with Mr.
Arjit Sharma and Ms. Sakshi Jha,
Advocates for State.
SI Yogesh Tanwar, P.S. Crime
Branch.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
19.08.2025

%

1. This Court, on 24th January, 2024, had passed the following order:

"1. The petitioner Sh. Shyam Lal is present-in-person and the IO identifies the petitioner. The petitioner states that he has neither signed the present petition nor the vakalatnama and he has not filed this petition. He also states that he does not know the counsel who is appearing in this case on behalf of petitioner. A separate statement to this effect has been recorded by this Court today.

2. Put for consideration on 29.02.2024

3. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith."

2. Subsequently on 21st October, 2024, Mr. Lokesh Ahlawat, Advocate, had appeared before this Court and refuted the statement attributed to the Petitioner in the order dated 24th January, 2024. Taking note of the said submission, the following order was passed:



“1. Mr. Lokesh Ahlawat, Advocate, appears for the petitioner and while disputing the petitioner’s statement as recorded in the order dated 24.01.2024, seeks time to file documents in this regard.

2. Mr. Bhandari, learned ASC for the State submits that in February 2024, the petitioner has approached the Trial Court with a similar request and on instructions from the I.O., states that the petitioner has made a similar statement in those proceedings and eventually, an FIR is also registered against unknown persons. He seeks time to verify the aforesaid instructions as well as file documents in this regard.

3. Renotify on 23.01.2025.

4. The petitioner shall remain present on the next date of hearing.”

3. Today, Mr. Shyam Lal is present in person. He categorically reiterates that he has neither executed any *vakalatnama* in favour of Mr. Lokesh Ahlawat nor filed the present petition. He maintains that he first learnt of these proceedings only through the Investigating Officer, following which he appeared before this Court on 24th January, 2024.

4. It also emerges from the record that the instant petition has been filed in the name of Grayline Supplies Impex (OPC) Pvt. Ltd., supported by an affidavit ostensibly sworn by Mr. Shyam Lal in the capacity of its director. However, Mr. Shyam Lal denies ever having been a director of the said company. According to him, his association with the company was limited to his employment as a peon on a monthly wage of INR 8,000/- and he was never part of the board of directors.

5. Mr. Shyam Lal has further denied the authenticity of his alleged signatures appearing on the petition, the supporting affidavit, the copy of the board resolution, and the *vakalatnama* filed in these proceedings. He reiterates that he has never authorised the filing of the petition and disclaims any role in the documents filed on record.

6. In view of the foregoing, it becomes manifest that the very foundation



of the present proceedings stands vitiated. The individual in whose name the petition has been instituted disowns authorship of the pleadings, the affidavit, and the *vakalatnama*. Once the identity and authority of the supposed Petitioner is placed in serious doubt, and in fact expressly repudiated, the proceedings cannot be allowed to continue. This Court is therefore constrained to hold that the petition is not maintainable. Accordingly, the present proceedings are disposed of.

7. However, before parting, this Court cannot but express its concern over the manner in which the present petition came to be instituted. The filing of proceedings in the name of a “ghost” petitioner strikes at the integrity of the judicial process and cannot be countenanced. At the same time, it is noted from the status report that FIR No. 52/2024, dated 4th March, 2024, has already been registered in respect of the same incident. Since the investigating agency is seized of the matter, no further directions are considered necessary at this stage. Needless to add, it shall remain open to the authorities concerned to take all steps as warranted in law if any misuse of process or forgery of documents is ultimately established.

8. This matter, however, raises grave concerns regarding the professional conduct of the counsel who filed the *vakalatnama* purportedly on behalf of the Petitioner. It bears emphasis that the said counsel not only filed the *vakalatnama* but also appeared before this Court on 21st October, 2024, and sought to refute the categorical statement of Mr. Shyam Lal, who had denied his signatures on both the petition and the *vakalatnama*. Such conduct, if ultimately substantiated, goes to the heart of the probity required of an advocate and undermines the trust reposed in the Bar as an institution. Having regard to these circumstances, and without making any conclusive



observation on the merits of the issue, this Court considers it appropriate to forward a copy of this order to the Bar Council of Delhi for its consideration and such action, as may be warranted in law.

9. Disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 19, 2025

as