



\$~59, 60

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

+ **TR.P.(CRL.) 72/2025 & CRL.M.A. 26439/2025**

DIMPY NANGIA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Asutosh Lohia, Mr. Varun
Kumar, Ms. Princy Sharma,
Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the
State with Insp. Satyender, PS EOW
Mr. Jaspreet Singh, Advocate for R-2
with R-2 in person

+ **TR.P.(CRL.) 73/2025 & CRL.M.A. 26570/2025**

DIMPY NANGIA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Asutosh Lohia, Mr. Varun
Kumar, Ms. Princy Sharma,
Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the
State
Mr. Jaspreet Singh, Advocate for R-2
with R-2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

04.09.2025

%



1. The present petitions under Section 447 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seek the following reliefs:

1.1. In TR.P.(CRL.) 72/2025:

*“a. Allow the instant Transfer Petition and transfer Ct No. 4716/2016 on FIR No. 831/2014 titled as “Dimpy Nangia & Anr. vs. Ravinder Pal Singh & Anr.” pending before Court of Learned ACJM, West Delhi, Tis Hazari Court, New Delhi, to the Court of Learned ACJM, South East, Saket Court, New Delhi wherein Cr. Case No. 93777/2016 titled “State vs. Harjinder Pal Singh & Ors.” is pending adjudication:
b. Pass any other and/or further Orders which this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in facts of the case.”*

1.2. In TR.P.(CRL.) 73/2025:

*“a. Allow the instant Transfer Petition and transfer Cr No. 8323/2018 in FIR No. 831/2014 titled as “State vs. Ravinder Pal Singh.” pending before Court of Learned ACJM, West Delhi, Tis Hazari Court, New Delhi, to the Court of Learned ACJM, South East, Saket Court, New Delhi wherein Cr. Case No. 93777/2016 titled “State vs. Harjinder Pal Singh & Ors.” is pending adjudication:
b. Pass any other and/or further Orders which this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in facts of the case.”*

2. At the outset, it is noted that both CT No. 4716/2016 and Cr No. 8323/2018, stem from FIR No. 831/2014. The said FIR was lodged by Respondent No. 2 (Ravinder Pal Singh) pursuant to directions of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, West District, Tis Hazari Courts under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973¹. Upon completion of investigation, the State filed a cancellation report under Section 173(2) of Cr.P.C., whereafter Respondent No. 2 instituted a protest petition, registered as Cr No. 8323/2018, which is currently pending before the ACJM, West District, Tis Hazari Courts. On the other hand, CT No. 4716/2016 pertains to

¹ “Cr.P.C.”



an application under Section 340 Cr.P.C. also pending before ACHM, West District, Tis Hazari Courts moved by Petitioner No. 1 (Dimpy Nangia, wife of Petitioner No. 2), seeking action under Section 182 IPC for alleged suppression of material facts and falsehood by Respondent No. 2 in proceedings arising from the same FIR.

3. Having regard to the above, it is evident that CT No. 4716/2016, though filed under Section 340 Cr.P.C. at the instance of the Petitioner No. 1, is only incidental to the proceedings emanating from FIR No. 831/2014. Likewise, the protest petition registered as Cr No. 8323/2018 also finds its genesis in the very same FIR. Accordingly, both matters are intrinsically linked to FIR No. 831/2014, and their adjudication cannot be divorced from the issues arising therein.

4. Conversely, CC No. 93777/2016, presently ongoing before the proposed transferee Court, stems from FIR No. 236/2013 registered on the complaint of Petitioner No. 2. In this matter, upon completion of investigation, the State filed a chargesheet, and the case is presently pending before the ACJM, South East District, Saket Courts, New Delhi.

5. Mr. Asutosh Lohia, counsel for the Petitioners, argues that the genesis of the dispute in the two FIRs (FIR No. 831/2013 and FIR No. 236/2013) is common and there exist substantial factual overlaps between the two sets of proceedings. It is urged that, in light of these commonalities, it would be appropriate and convenient for the matters arising from both FIRs to be adjudicated by the same Court.

6. However, upon consideration of the overall circumstances, this Court finds that the two proceedings are at different stages and do not warrant joint adjudication. Both CT No. 4716/2016 and Cr No. 8323/2018 relate to and



arise solely from FIR No. 831/2014. Proceedings under the said FIR are currently at the stage where a cancellation report has already been filed by the State. In contrast, the case emanating from FIR No. 236/2013, i.e., CC No. 93777/2016, stands on an altogether different footing, where the investigation has culminated in the filing of a chargesheet and the matter is presently pending at the stage of compliance under Section 207 of Cr.P.C.

7. Therefore, while there may be certain factual intersections between the two FIRs as argued by the Petitioners, the current stage of each FIR is very different. The matters arising from FIR No. 831/2014 are at the stage of closure, whereas the proceedings arising out of FIR No. 236/2013 have not advanced beyond pre-trial compliance. These circumstances do not justify transfer for consolidated adjudication before a single Court, notwithstanding the degree of similarity, or point of convergence, if any.

8. It is also relevant to note that the proceedings in both the FIRs have been pending for approximately a decade. This extended passage of time further underscores the distinct stages at which the respective matters currently stand.

9. Having regard to the aforementioned circumstances, the Court finds no basis to accede to the request made in the petitions and accordingly, same are dismissed along with pending application.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 4, 2025/ab