



\$~69

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1127/2025**

RAMESH KUMAR PANDIT

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate**

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for the State with Mr. Kshitiz Garg, Mr. Ashvini Kumar, Mr. Nitish Dhawan, Ms. Chavi Lazarus, Ms. Sanskriti Nimbekar, Advocates with SI Ashok Singh Chauhan, PS Nihal Vihar**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

08.04.2025

%

CRL.M.A. 10751/2025 (Exemption)

1. Exemption is granted, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Petitioner shall file legible and clearer copies of exempted documents, compliant with practice rules, before the next date of hearing.
3. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 1127/2025

4. The present writ petition seeks following prayers:

“Pass a writ of mandamus or any other writ, order or direction thereby directing the Ld. Trial Court to conduct the trial expeditiously in FIR No. 457/2023 U/S 420/468/471/34 IPC, Police Station Nihal Vihar, Delhi



which is currently pending trial in the Hon'ble Court of Ms. Komal Garg, Ld. MM-03, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, titled as State Vs. Suman and to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible, in the interest of justice.

b. pass any other order or relief, which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent."

5. Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC (Criminal) for the State, submits that investigation in the present case is currently ongoing, and that they shall make all possible efforts to conclude the same expeditiously.

6. In any event, in the opinion of the Court, in case there is any delay in carrying out the investigation, the Petitioner has a remedy to approach the concerned Court, requesting for early conclusion of the investigation. The Supreme Court, in the judgement in *Sakiri Vasu v. State of U.P.*,¹ has categorically observed that High Courts must discourage the practice of entertaining writ petitions solely on the ground of alleged inadequacy in the conduct of investigation. The relevant observations of the Supreme Court are as follows:

"27. As we have already observed above, the Magistrate has very wide powers to direct registration of an FIR and to ensure a proper investigation, and for this purpose he can monitor the investigation to ensure that the investigation is done properly (though he cannot investigate himself). The High Court should discourage the practice of filing a writ petition or petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. simply because a person has a grievance that his FIR has not been registered by the police, or after being registered, proper investigation has not been done by the police. For this grievance, the remedy lies under Sections 36 and 154(3) before the concerned police officers, and if that is of no avail, under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. before the Magistrate or by filing a criminal complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C. and not by filing a writ petition or a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C."

7. In view of the foregoing, the Court finds no reason to entertain the

¹ (2008) 2 SCC 409.



present petition.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.
9. Petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the Trial Court, if so advised.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

APRIL 8, 2025/ab