



\$~23

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(CRL) 672/2025 & CRL.M.A. 6283/2025

DHARMENDRA SINGH RAWATPetitioner

Through: Mr. Chirag Madan, Mr.
Sai Krishna Kumar, Mr.
Rahul Agarwal & Mr.
Ronit Bose, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari,
ASC for the State with Mr.
Arjit Sharma, Adv.
SI Pramod Kumar, PS-
Crime Branch
Mr. Amit Tiwari, Ms.
Avshreya Pratap Singh
Rudy, Ms. Harshita
Chaturvedi, Mr. Md.
Junaid Mahmood, Mr.
Ayush Tanwar & Ms.
Ayushi Srivastav, Advs.
for complainant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

01.09.2025

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 29/2025 dated 29.01.2025 for offences under Sections 318(4)/316(2)/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station Crime Branch.
2. The FIR was registered pursuant to complaint made by the complainant namely– Sharat Bhattatiripad, who alleged that one Divesh Rawat (son of the petitioner) had, on the basis of false



and forged documents, lured and induced the complainant to invest his money and savings to the tune of ₹1,24,63,699/- in the business of trading in stocks and shares, future and options to yield high returns from the investments, through the sole proprietorship concern of Divesh Rawat, namely– DD Enterprises, in which the petitioner was playing an active role in its day-to-day activities.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no allegations have been made against the petitioner in regard to the alleged crime. The petitioner was, thus, made accused in the present FIR, solely for the reason that he is the father of the other accused Divesh Rawat.

4. At the outset, it is informed that that the chargesheet has already been filed and the petitioner has not been named as an accused in the present case.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even if the petitioner has not been named as an accused in the present case and is not been found to be involved in the crime in the final report filed by the State, the petition seeking quashing of the FIR can still be maintained.

6. This argument, in the opinion of this Court, is without any merit.

7. The FIR is nothing but recording of the complaint given of the victim. Once the FIR has already been investigated and the final report has been filed and the Police has not found any evidence against the petitioner which has led to him not being named in the chargesheet and the learned Trial Court not being requested to frame charges against him, the petition seeking quashing of proceedings emanating from the present FIR, is not



maintainable at this stage.

8. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court or initiate appropriate proceedings in case any grievance remains or if at some stage, the authorities find involvement of the petitioner in the alleged crime.

9. The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 1, 2025

“SS”