



\$~74

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2434/2025**

VINOD CHANDNA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sharma, Mr. Anshul Khatri,
Advocates

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
the State with Ms. Priyam Aggarwal,
Mr. Abhinav Kr. Arya, Mr. Aryan
Sachdeva, Advocates along with SI
Manisha, PS Rani Bagh

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

06.08.2025

%

1. The present petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (formerly Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973¹) seeks directions for expeditious proceedings and effective judicial supervision in FIR No. 307/2013, registered under Sections 498A, 406, 304B, 306, and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at P.S. Rani Bagh, titled *State v. Tushar*,
2. The Petitioner is the Complainant in FIR No. 307/2013 which pertains to the unnatural death of his daughter, alleged to be a suicide. He submits that despite a lapse of more than 12 years since the registration of the FIR,

¹ "Cr.P.C."



the trial is yet to commence.

3. A perusal of the order dated 3rd February, 2020 reveals that in the supplementary chargesheet, the State had shown the accused as absconding. However, proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. had not been initiated against them. In these circumstances, the ACMM, North-West District, Rohini Courts declined to accept the supplementary chargesheet and directed the Investigating Officer (“IO”) to move an appropriate application regarding extradition of the accused who is stated to be residing in Australia. Since then, the subsequent orders do not indicate any concrete action having been taken by the State.

4. In order dated 03rd April, 2025, the ACMM notes as follows:

“On LDOH, accused persons were summoned through MEA as per rules through DCP. Report received today that due to lapse on the part of SI Parminder, summons could not be served.

Some more time is sought for service of summons.

An application for issuance of LOC against accused persons has been moved on behalf of complainant/father of deceased. Copy supplied to SI Sunil Nath.

IO SI Sunil Nath is directed to file report on NDOH.

Accordingly, issue summons to accused persons through MEA as per the rules to /Be executed through DCP concerned.

Put up for report/ further proceedings on 07.11.2025.”

5. It thus appears that the directions issued to the IO for taking appropriate steps against the accused persons have not been complied with.

6. Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for the State, apprises the Court that a Look-Out Circular was initially issued against the accused persons in 2015, which expired in 2016 and no fresh circulars have since been issued. He further submits, on instructions, that the accused persons own some immovable property which is situated in Delhi.

7. Such information ought to have been promptly placed before the



concerned Magistrate so that appropriate proceedings could have been initiated for securing the presence of the accused persons. Nevertheless, in the given circumstances, and noting the inordinate delay in the matter, the Court considers it appropriate to issue the following directions:

7.1. The concerned DCP is directed to examine the case file and ensure that the State takes all necessary steps for reinstatement of the Look-Out Circulars and initiation of proceedings under Sections 82 and 83 Cr.P.C. against the accused persons, in accordance with law

7.2. Once all these formalities are completed, the concerned Magistrate shall thereafter proceed to expeditiously commit the matter for trial.

8. With the above directions, the present petition is disposed of.

9. Since the accused persons are not present before the Court. All their rights and contentions are left open.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 6, 2025/ab