



\$~55

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1927/2025**

HIMANSHU VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manan Batra and Mr. Varun
Tyagi, Advocates.

versus

INCOME TAX OFFICE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shlok Chandra, Senior Standing
Counsel with Ms. Naincy Jain, Jr.
Standing Counsel with Ms. Madhavi
Shukla, Jr. Standing Counsel .

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

04.04.2025

CRL.M.A.10329/2025 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.A. 10328/2025

3. Application under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*) has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner, Himanshu Verma seeking clarification in the Order dated 21.03.2025.

4. It is submitted in the Application that the modification of the condition was sought in two Orders i.e. 07.09.2024 made in six Complaints and Order dated 20.07.2024 made in the 7th Complaint but inadvertently, in Paragraph 5 while modifying the condition, the Order has been mentioned



only as 07.09.2024 and be modified to include the Order 20.07.2024 as well.

5. **Submissions heard and the record perused.**

6. There is indeed a typographical error. The paragraph 5 of the impugned Order dated 21.03.2025 be read as modification of the condition in the Order dated 07.09.2024, as well as 20.07.2024, in respect of the Complaints as mentioned in paragraph 1 of the Order.

7. It is also pointed out that the name of the learned counsel for the Petitioner, has been mentioned as '*Manav Batra*' when in fact it is '*Manan Batra*'. The same be read as stated herein.

8. The Application is disposed of accordingly.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

APRIL 4, 2025/RS