



\$~59 to 65

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.REV.P.(NI) 45/2025, CRL.M.A. 5442/2025 & CRL.M.A.
5443/2025

LEO INFRACAPITAL LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Mr.
Prateek Goyal, Mr. Risabh Kumar &
Ms. Saloni Mahajan, Advs.

versus

RADLAY METAL PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED
& ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal
Sachdeva and Ms. Katyani Vajpayee,
Advs.

60

+ CRL.REV.P.(NI) 46/2025, CRL.M.A. 5446/2025 & CRL.M.A.
5447/2025

LEO ISPAT LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Mr.
Prateek Goyal, Mr. Risabh Kumar &
Ms. Saloni Mahajan, Advs.

versus

RADLAY METAL PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED
& ORS.Respondents



Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal Sachdeva and Ms. Katyani Vajpayee, Advs.

61

+ CRL.REV.P.(NI) 47/2025, CRL.M.A. 5449/2025 & CRL.M.A. 5450/2025

LEO INFRACAPITAL LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Mr. Prateek Goyal, Mr. Risabh Kumar & Ms. Saloni Mahajan, Advs.

versus

RADLAY METAL PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED
& ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal Sachdeva and Ms. Katyani Vajpayee, Advs.

62

+ CRL.REV.P.(NI) 48/2025, CRL.M.A. 5453/2025 & CRL.M.A. 5454/2025

LEO INFRACAPITAL LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Mr. Prateek Goyal, Mr. Risabh Kumar & Ms. Saloni Mahajan, Advs.

versus

RADLAY METAL PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED
& ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal Sachdeva and Ms. Katyani Vajpayee, Advs.

63



+ CRL.REV.P.(NI) 49/2025, CRL.M.A. 5456/2025 & CRL.M.A. 5457/2025

LEO ISPAT LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Mr. Prateek Goyal, Mr. Risabh Kumar & Ms. Saloni Mahajan, Advs.

versus

RADLAY METAL PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED
& ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal Sachdeva and Ms. Katyani Vajpayee, Advs.

64

+ CRL.REV.P.(NI) 50/2025, CRL.M.A. 5459/2025 & CRL.M.A. 5460/2025

LEO ISPAT LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Mr. Prateek Goyal, Mr. Risabh Kumar & Ms. Saloni Mahajan, Advs.

versus

RADLAY METAL PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED
& ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal Sachdeva and Ms. Katyani Vajpayee, Advs.

65

+ CRL.REV.P.(NI) 51/2025



LEO INFRACAPITAL LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Mr.
Prateek Goyal, Mr. Risabh Kumar &
Ms. Saloni Mahajan, Advs.

versus

RADLAY METAL PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal
Sachdeva and Ms. Katyani Vajpayee,
Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

10.12.2025

%

1. The present set of revision petitions are directed against a common judgment dated 15th May, 2023, passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi, in seven criminal appeals preferred by the accused.
2. By the impugned order, the Appellate Court, while deciding the appeals filed by the accused challenging their conviction and sentence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881¹, partly allowed the same by acquitting one of the Directors, Accused No. 3 (Vimmi Kakkar). The conviction of Accused No. 1 (Radlay Metal Products Pvt. Ltd.) and Accused No. 2 (Naresh Kumar) was upheld. Consequently, in view of the acquittal of Accused No. 3, the order on sentence was modified to clarify that no independent liability would exist on Vimmi Kakkar, and the fine

¹ "NI Act"



amount would be deemed to have been imposed on Accused No. 1 company and Accused No. 2.

3. It is pertinent to note that the present revision petitions have been filed after a delay of 545 days from the impugned order.

4. Notwithstanding this gross delay, which, in the opinion of the Court, has not been satisfactorily explained, it is pertinent to note that the compensation amount as per order of sentence stands paid to the complainant by Accused No. 1 company and Naresh Kumar. Thus, the Petitioner has already received the compensation amount which includes the cheque amount and also interest thereon. In view of the foregoing, coupled with the inordinate and unexplained delay in filing these revision petitions, this Court finds no ground to entertain the petitions both on the ground of inordinate and unexplained delay as well as being devoid of merits.

5. Accordingly, the present revision petitions are dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

DECEMBER 10, 2025/ng