



\$~57 & 58

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1491/2025 & CRL.M.A. 6681/2025**

GAUTAM BHALLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas Pahwa, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Advocate.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP.
SI Khushbu Yadav, PS: Kalkaji.
Mr. Uday Bedi and Mr. Varisha
Sharma, Advocates for R-2.

+ **CRL.M.C. 1502/2025 & CRL.M.A. 6815/2025**

ANIL BHALLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ramesh Gupta, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Advocate.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP.
SI Khushbu Yadav, PS: Kalkaji.
Mr. Uday Bedi and Mr. Varisha
Sharma, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

04.03.2025

%

1. The present petitions assail orders dated 15th February, 2025 passed in



Criminal Revision No. 571/2024 and Criminal Revision No. 572/2024 whereby by the ASJ-05, South East District, New Delhi has declined to stay the trial court proceedings during the pendency of the revision petitions.

2. Mr. Ramesh Gupta and Mr. Vikas Pahwa, Senior Counsel for the Petitioners, states that Respondent No. 2 (Complainant) filed complaint alleging offences under Section 420/406/120/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. On the said complaint, Petitioners were summoned on 29th July, 2024. The Petitioners have since assailed the orders dated 29th July, 2024 in the aforesaid revision petitions which are presently pending consideration before the Revision Court. Petitioners had also applied for stay of the operation of the orders dated 29th July, 2024, which request was declined by the impugned orders dated 15th February, 2025. They also highlight that the refund amount, as directed to be paid by order dated 15th March, 2023 passed by the National Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, New Delhi in Consumer Complaint No. 1344/2017, has been duly transferred to Respondent No. 2.

3. Both the Senior Counsel state that since the revision petitions are pending consideration, the Trial Court proceedings ought to have been stayed. Nonetheless, they state that the Trial Court has directed the personal appearance of the Petitioners for the purpose of furnishing bail bonds, they are willing to comply with the same. However, considering age of Mr. Anil Bhalla, who is 75 years, he may be exempted from personal appearance. A similar request is also made on behalf of Mr. Gautam Bhalla on the ground that he is being summoned the second time, despite the fact that the first summoning order was remanded back to the Trial Court.

4. The Court has considered the afore-noted submissions. Since Mr.



Gupta and Mr. Pahwa have only requested for exemption from personal appearance, the Court need not dwell into the merits of the case. Accordingly, the present petitions are disposed of with a direction that Petitioners shall appear through their Advocate and furnish the bail bonds before the Trial Court. The Petitioners shall appear through video conferencing mechanism. The sureties have to, nonetheless, appear in person. The Trial Court, on being satisfied, shall accept the bail bonds, in accordance with law.

5. Petitioners' request for exemption from personal appearance, in further proceedings, shall be considered by the Trial Court on its own merits, in accordance with law.

6. With the above directions, the present petitions are disposed of, along with pending application.

7. It is clarified that the Court has not examined the merits of the case. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 4, 2025

d.negi