



\$~30

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

+ W.P.(C) 5341/2025

AJAY AGGARWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aryan Singh, Adv.
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Kshitij Chhabra, SPC and Mr.
Abhijeet Vikram Singh, Adv. for
UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

25.04.2025

CM APPL.24327/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5341/2025

3. The limited relief sought by the petitioner in the present case is that the respondents be directed to update their records to reflect that the petitioner has been acquitted by the concerned Court in FIR No.0190/2011 dated 28.06.2011 under Section 3 of the DP Act, registered at Police Station Rani Bagh.
4. The petitioner submits that *vide* a certificate dated 14.01.2025, bearing no. 48/Verification Cell/OD issued by the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, Outer District, Delhi, it has been mentioned as under:

“This is to certify that as per report of SHO/Rani Bagh Ajay Aggarwal S/o Sh. Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal is residing at Ho.NO.A-16, Saraswati Vihar, Pitampura, Delhi-110034. He is involved in Case FIR No.0190/2011 U/s 3 DP Act Police Station Rani Bagh. This certificate is being issued for Delhi Legislative Assembly Election-2025 only.”

This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/05/2025 at 12:23:37



The said certificate, with which the petitioner is aggrieved, has been handed over during the course of hearing.

5. It is submitted that the petitioner had already been acquitted in the concerned FIR contrary to what is mentioned in the aforesaid certificate. It is further submitted that earlier, the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, North West District, Delhi Police had itself issued a certificate bearing no. 874/CVC/Genl.Br./NWD dated 30.03.2017, stating that one FIR No. 422/2005 registered against the petitioner was compromised on 06.04.2008 and another FIR under Section 3 of the DP Act culminated in an acquittal order passed by the concerned Court in Rohini. It is submitted that confusion has been created on account of multiple/ contradictory certificates being issued by the respondent.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents, who appears on advance notice states, on instructions, that the necessary updation in the records of the concerned department shall be made and it shall be ensured that in any future certificate/s issued by the said respondents, it is duly recorded that the petitioner has been acquitted in the concerned FIR.

7. The above redresses the grievance raised by the petitioner in the present petition. No further order/s are required to be passed. The petition is accordingly, disposed of.

SACHIN DATTA, J

APRIL 25, 2025/cl