



\$~56

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

+ CRL.M.C. 5769/2025 & CRL.M.A. 24711/2025

ABDUL SUBHAN QURESHI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. M.S. Khan, Mr.
Prashant Prakash, Ms.
Qausar Khan, Mr. Rahul
Sahani and Mr. Zahbi
Tihami, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP
for the State with SI Nehit
Phogat, PS Special Cell,
NDR.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **21.08.2025**

1. The present petition is filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No. 50/2014 dated 21.10.2014, registered at police station Special Cell (SB), for the offence under Section 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') and Section 18 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 ('UAPA').
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no material against the petitioner to implicate him for any offence.
3. At the outset, it is pointed out that the FIR was registered way back in the year 2014 and the chargesheet was filed in the year 2018 itself for the offences under Section 120B of the IPC and Sections 18/20 of the UAPA.
4. On being pointedly asked, it is informed that the matter is now listed before the learned Trial Court for arguments on charge.
5. The petitioner has the remedy of addressing arguments and



raising all issues before the learned Trial Court while arguing on charge. Undisputedly, if there is no material against the accused, an appropriate order of discharge will be passed by the learned Trial Court. However, the same is to be considered by the learned Trial Court.

6. While this Court is empowered to quash criminal proceedings even after filing of chargesheet to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of law, it is well settled that ordinarily, this Court should be cautious to exercise inherent jurisdiction and interfere with the proceedings after chargesheet has been filed after thorough investigation [Ref. ***State of Odisha v. Pratima Mohanty and Others: (2022) 16 SCC 703***].

7. In such circumstances, this Court does not consider it apposite to entertain the present petition at this stage.

8. At this juncture, it is stated that the arguments on charge were heard by the learned Trial Court on different occasions, however, on account of change of Roster, no order could be passed and the matter is still at the same stage.

9. Considering the same and that the chargesheet was filed way back in the year 2018, the learned Trial Court is requested to expedite hearing arguments on charge.

10. The petition stands disposed of with aforesaid observations.

11. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court in case any grievance remains in future.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 21, 2025/DU