



\$~70

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1691/2023, CRL.M.A. 33211/2025**

SH SAMAY GARG

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shiv Charan Garg, Mr. Imran
Khan, Ms. Jahanvi Garg and
Ms. Chanchal Garg, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, SC for State with
Ms. Priyam Agarwal and
Mr. Abhinav Kr. Arya, Advocates.
SI Sourabh Malik, PS-KNK Marg.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

11.11.2025

1. The matter is listed today on an application; however, the Court has considered it appropriate to hear the main petition itself.
2. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950 read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeks quashing of FIR No. 510/2021 under Sections 448/420/380/511/34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at P.S., K.N. Katju Marg.
3. The contention of the Petitioner is that he has been falsely implicated in the FIR. He submits that two civil suits concerning the suit property, as well as a writ petition, are pending adjudication before this Court. The Petitioner further relies on the documents enclosed with CRL.M.A.



33211/2025 to contend that on the alleged date of the incident, i.e., 19th February, 2021, he was attending online classes and was therefore not present at the place of occurrence. He also places reliance on the sale deeds to demonstrate that the allegations of the complainant are *ex facie* false.

4. In the opinion of this Court, since the investigation is still underway, the Petitioner's request in CRL.M.A. 33211/2025 that the Investigating Officer should examine the said documents is found to be meritorious.

5. Accordingly, a direction is issued to the concerned IO to consider the documents annexed with the application during the course of investigation.

6. In light of the foregoing, and since the Petitioner has furnished documents which are required to be duly examined by the Investigating Officer, this Court finds no reason to keep the present petition pending. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open. In case the investigation culminates in a chargesheet against the Petitioner, they shall be at liberty to take recourse to appropriate remedies, in accordance with law.

7. Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, confirms that no custodial interrogation of the Petitioner is presently required. Should such a need arise at any stage, due notice shall be issued to the Petitioner.

8. The petition is disposed of along with pending application.

9. The date of 4th February, 2026, stands cancelled.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 11, 2025

nk