



\$~52

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2782/2022**

RAKESH GITARAM BHATT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shivamsinh
Deshmukh, Adv. (through
VC)

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Rupali
Bandhopadhya, ASC for
the State with Ms. Amisha
Gupta, Adv.
SI Amit, PS- Samaipur
Badli

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

14.11.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 618/2022 dated 19.08.2022 for offence under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Samaipur Badli.

2. Briefly stated, the FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2/President of TR Sawhney Motors Private Limited. It is alleged that the accused Sumedh and Sahil worked as a Direct Sale agent with TR Sawhney Motors Private Limited (hereafter '**company**') and had purchased numerous cars from the company for their clients. It is alleged that an Ertiga VXi CNG was booked by the accused Sumedh and Sahil in the name of the petitioner and the balance amount of ₹8 lakhs was transferred by the petitioner in the account of the company for getting an early delivery, however, the same was not delivered to him. It is alleged that when the petitioner sought refund of his



money against the cancellation, it was found that the amount deposited by the petitioner on 09.12.2021 was credited against the order of another customer namely Ravindra Kanip Mane, who was also the reference of accused Sumedh and Sahil. It is alleged that the accused Sumedh and Sahil had requested to adjust the said amount transferred by the petitioner against the order of Ravindra Kanip Mane who had also booked an Ertiga VXi CNG from the company and had got a delivery on 09.12.2021. It is alleged that the petitioner along with accused Sumedh, Sahil and Ravinder Kanip Mane conspired to cheat Respondent No.2 of Rs.8,00,000/-.

3. The learned Standing Counsel for the State submits that since the other co-accused have been absconding, the investigation could not be completed.
4. He submits that appropriate steps will be taken expeditiously for filing a report before the learned Trial Court.
5. He submits that, at this stage, no evidence has been found against the petitioner and, therefore, no action is proposed against the petitioner.
6. Considering the above, no orders are required to be passed at this stage since no action is proposed against the petitioner.
7. The State is directed to expedite filing of the report.
8. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.
9. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court in case any grievance remains in future.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 14, 2025/“SS”