



\$~11

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

+ **CRL.L.P. 63/2021**

C.B.I.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Atul Guleria, Special Public
Prosecutor for CBI with Mr. Aryan
Rakesh & Mr. Pankaj Kumar,
Advocates

Versus

SH. RAVINDER SINGH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sudarshan Raj, Mohd. Qamer Ali
& Ms. Priyanka, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER
03.04.2025

%

Crl.M.A. 9755/2021

1. There is delay of 168 days in filing the Criminal Leave Petition seeking Leave to Appeal against the Judgment and Order dated 23.07.2019 passed by the learned Special Judge, CBI.
2. For the reasons stated in the Application, delay is condoned.
3. The Application is disposed of.

CRL.L.P. 63/2021

4. The present Petition under Section 378(3) Cr.P.C. has been filed seeking leave to Appeal against the Judgment and Order dated 23.07.2019 passed by the learned Special Judge, CBI whereby Respondents have been



acquitted of the charges under Sections 120B read with Sections 420/468/471/477A IPC and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 in CC No.286/2019.

5. Petitioner- CBI has submitted that there is testimony of PW-6 and PW-9, which corroborates and establishes that the bills through which the Johnson Pipes were allegedly procured by Respondents No.2 & 3 and forged and fabricated. It has reached to the conclusion that the pipes installed at the site were not of the make as was agreed in the Contract and that pipes installed at the site were not of the make as was agreed in the contract. It is submitted there are other grounds to challenge the impugned judgment.

6. For the grounds stated in the Petition, Leave to Appeal is allowed.

7. The Petition is accordingly disposed of.

CRL. APPEAL----- (BE NUMBERED BY THE REGISTRY)

8. Arguments heard.

9. Judgment reserved.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

APRIL 3, 2025

r