



\$~30

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

+ **TR.P.(CRL.) 70/2023 & CRL.M.A. 14539/2023**

RAMESH CHANDER GOYAL & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal Sachdeva and Ms. Katyayani Vajpayee, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP for the State.

Ms. Ateepriya Bhatia, Advocate for R-2 with Mr. Sandeet Garg, CEO of R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

01.07.2025

1. The present transfer petition seeks the following prayers:

“a. Issue necessary directions for withdrawal and transfer of 6 Criminal Complaints, filed by the Respondent No. 2 against the petitioners, all entitled “LEO ISPAT LIMITED VERSUS RAMESH CHANDER GOYAL AND 2 OTHERS” {bearing CC No. CC Nos. 465572/2016, 471592/2016, 471593/2016, 471641/2016, 475247 and 475248/2016 }; presently pending in the Court of Sh Rakesh Siddharth, Special Metropolitan Magistrate, NI Act, District South East, Saket Courts, Delhi, under section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act to the Court of Sh Tushar Gupta, Metropolitan Magistrate, New Delhi District, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi where another complaint under section 200 CrPC filed by the Respondent No. 2 against the petitioners for the alleged commission of offence under section 415/416/420/463/467/468/471 read with section 120 B IPC, entitled “LEO ISPAT LIMITED VERSUS RAMESH CHANDER GOYAL AND 2 OTHERS” is pending or to any other Court of competent jurisdiction.”



2. Counsel for Respondent No. 2 states that trial in the complaints filed under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 sought to be transferred as mentioned in the prayer clause extracted above, stands concluded and matters are now scheduled for final hearing. This statement is not disputed by Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, counsel for Petitioner.
3. Having regard to the fact that the cases sought to be transferred are at the stage of hearing final arguments and the complaint filed under Section 200 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 which is pending before Patiala House Courts, is at the stage of recording pre-charge evidence, the Court finds no reason to allow Petitioner's request.
4. Accordingly, the present petition, along with pending application, is dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JULY 1, 2025
d.negi