



\$~67

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 2798/2025**

YASH VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Yadav, Advocate

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manjeet Arya, APP for State with
SI Mahesh Yadav, PS Dwarka North

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

O R D E R

25.04.2025

%

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

CRL.M.A. 12510/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 2798/2025 & CRL.M.A. 12509/2025 (stay)

2. Vide order dated 27.01.2025, passed by the trial court in proceedings arise out of FIR 317/2016 of PS Dwarka North, the learned trial court allowed the prosecution to examine the solitary witness of the incident through videoconferencing for the reason that the witness is residing in Canada and has expressed inability to appear personally. Before the trial court, the only objection raised on behalf of the present petitioner/accused was that without his consent, testimony of the witness through videoconferencing cannot be recorded. It is the said order that is challenged by petitioner through the present petition.



3. Learned APP accepts notice.
4. After part arguments, learned counsel for petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this petition with the request that the trial court be directed to ensure adherence to the rules already formulated for recording of testimony through videoconferencing and otherwise, petitioner has no objection if the said witness of the prosecution is examined through videoconferencing.
5. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn, requesting the learned trial court to ensure adherence to the videoconferencing rules.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 25, 2025/as

Click here to check corrigendum, if any