



\$~72

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6454/2025 & CRL.M.A. 27231/2025,
CRL.M.A. 27232/2025

DEEPAK PANWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Uttam Datt, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Aniket
Gautam, Mr. Addtya
Kapoor, Mr. Praveen
Singh, Mr. Akashdeep
Gupta, Ms. Sonakshi
Singh, Mr. Bhaskar and
Mr. P. Amrut, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP for
the State with SI Shivom,
PS Madhu Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **11.09.2025**

1. The present petition is filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR No. 130/2018 dated 09.05.2018, registered at Police Station Madhu Vihar, for the offences under Sections 376D/506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC').

2. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that a frivolous complaint was filed by the complainant which led to registration of the FIR. He submits that the complainant and the petitioner worked in the same department and the allegations also led to departmental proceedings against the petitioner, where the allegations were found to be false. He relies upon the judgment in the case of *Ashoo Surendranath Tewari v. CBI : (2020) 9*



SCC 636 to contend that if the same set of allegations leads to criminal proceedings as well as departmental proceedings, criminal prosecution cannot be allowed to continue once the accused is exonerated on merits in departmental proceedings.

3. He further submits that even though chargesheet was filed long back in the year 2020 and the cognizance was taken on 27.02.2021, however, the matter has not proceeded further. He submits that the pendency of the criminal case is causing grave prejudice to the promotional prospects of the petitioner.

4. He however fairly submits that at this stage, the petitioner will be satisfied if directions are given to the learned Trial Court to expedite hearing arguments on charge. He submits that all arguments will be taken before the learned Trial Court and he is hopeful that an appropriate order will be passed after taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner has already been exonerated in departmental proceedings.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with direction to the learned Trial Court to expedite the hearing of arguments on charge.

6. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court in case the trial is delayed further.

7. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 11, 2025

DU