



\$~19

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CRL.M.C. 5922/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25226/2025

LEENE SHEILA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. M.F. Philip,
Ms. Purnima Krishna, Mr.
Karamveer Singh Yadav
& Mr. Togin M. Babichen,
Advs.

versus

**CENTRAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anupam S. Sharma,
SPP

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

10.10.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed challenging the order dated 31.07.2025 (hereafter '**the impugned order**'), passed by the learned Magistrate, Rouse Avenue District Courts, New Delhi, in CBI Case No. 256/2019.

2. By the impugned order, the learned Magistrate had summoned the petitioner (arraigned as PW 12 in the case) for recording her testimony as the petitioner was having difficulty in understanding the questions put to her over video conferencing. The impugned order reflects that some disturbance and connectivity issues arose when the petitioner appeared on video conference from Court Complex Perumbavoor for her examination-in-chief.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the alleged offence happened almost three decades back and the petitioner, who is 71



years of age, is not in a position to travel to Delhi from her residence in Kochi for the purpose of deposition due to her frail health. It is stated that part examination-in-chief of the petitioner was conducted by video conference and her deposition ought to be completed without insisting on her physical presence.

4. A reference is made to Rule 13 (d) of the Electronic Evidence and Video Conference Rules, 2015 (notified by the High Court of Delhi) which provides that if a witness, who is to be examined, is not capable of reaching Court due to sickness or physical infirmity, the Court may authorise conduct of video conferencing from where the person is located and the Court may also direct use of portable video conferencing systems to ensure presence as it may deem fit.

5. Status report has been filed by the Central Bureau of Investigation and it has been verified that the petitioner is suffering from various severe health complications which render her unable to travel.

6. The present case is one where the petitioner was initially being examined by way of video conferencing and she was only summoned to appear physically due to connectivity issues cropping up in video conferencing. As provided in Rule 13 of the Electronic Evidence and Video Conference Rules, 2015, the Court is empowered to rectify such issues by making alternate arrangements for better connectivity, including by use of portable video conferencing systems.

7. In view of the above, the impugned order is set aside to the extent of the summons issued to the petitioner for appearing physically.

8. The learned Trial Court is directed to make alternate



arrangement for recording the evidence of the petitioner in terms of Rule 13 of the Electronic Evidence and Video Conference Rules, 2015.

9. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 10, 2025

“SS”