



\$~55

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 1631/2025 & CRL.M.A. 7366/2025**
M/S KRISHNA CLOTHING COMPANYPetitioner

Through: Mr. Anul Kumar Dhupar, Advocate.
(through VC).

versus

STATE GOVT NCT OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

% **ORDER**
07.03.2025

1. The present petition is directed against order dated 27th November, 2024, which reads as follows:

“At 02:25 pm

Present: Sh. Manish Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the complainant.

Accused absent.

Perusal of record reveals that the accused last appeared physically before the Court on 09.11.2022 and since then, he has entered appearance only virtually. Today, the matter is fixed for SA. However, accused has not appeared. It seems that the accused is not taking the proceedings of the court seriously.

In view of the circumstances, I deem it fit to issue NBWs against the accused to be executed through DCP concerned.

DCP concerned is directed to ensure that multiple attempts are made for the execution of the warrants. Further, DCP concerned is directed to ensure that the statement of two independent witnesses is recorded at the time of execution of



*process and copy of their ID card is also be taken.
List the matter for SA on 10.03.2025.*

At 03:25 pm

At this stage, accused has joined through VC and Id. Counsel Sh. A.K. Dhuppar on behalf of accused has appeared in person.

*In view of appearance of accused through VC, **NBWs stand stayed till NDOH.** Accused is directed to appear in person on NDOH failing which coercive steps will be taken against the accused.*

*List on date already fixed i.e. **10.03.2025.**”*

2. As can be seen from the above order, Non Bailable Warrants which were issued against the Petitioner, have been stayed on the same date, as the Petitioner/Accused had appeared through the video conferencing mechanism.
3. The Petitioner’s request for appearance through video conferencing has been sufficiently accommodated by the Trial Court as can be noticed from the impugned order. It is only for the purpose of recording of statement of the accused, that the Court had directed the presence of the accused.
4. The Petitioner now seeks a blanket order from this Court allowing him to appear before the Trial Court through video conferencing mechanism.
5. In the opinion of the Court, the manner in which the proceedings be conducted is to be decided by the Trial Court. The Trial Court has sufficiently accommodated Petitioner’s request during the course of regular proceedings and it is only for recording his statement that the Trial Court required the Petitioner to be present in person.
6. As per the Petitioner’s address in the memo of parties, he resides in Delhi, however, no arguments have been addressed as to why he cannot



appear before the Court.

7. In the opinion of the Court, the present matter doesn't not warrant the intervention of this Court.

8. Accordingly, the present petition, along with pending application, is dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 7, 2025

as