



\$~58

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6685/2025 & CRL.M.A. 28129/2025**

UNIVERSAL BLUE REALTECH PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Agarwal, Ms.
Eesha Sharma, Ms. Mahek
Verma, Ms. Alankrita
Shukla, Mr. Dharmender
Kumar and Ms. Gurpreet
Kaur, Advocates.

versus

RAJA DAVINDER SINGH

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ram Gopal, Adv.
through V.C.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

18.09.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed by the petitioner challenging the order dated 12.07.2025 (hereafter '**impugned order**') passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge ('**PDSJ**'), Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi in Criminal Revision No. 327/2025.

2. By the impugned order the learned PDSJ allowed the revision petition filed by the respondent.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner will be satisfied if directions are given for expeditious disposal of the proceedings. He submits that the subject complaint was filed ten years back and the matter has not been decided due to the delay caused by the respondent.

4. He submits that the matter was also heard by different Presiding Officers. He submits that the matter was reserved for



judgment in the year 2024, however, on account of change in the Roster, the matter was again heard by a subsequent Presiding Officer.

5. He submits that the learned Presiding Officer thereafter heard and sought certain clarifications for which certain documents were filed pursuant to the order made by the Court. He submits that the respondent taking the same as an opportunity has again sought to reopen the case. He submits that the petitioner has no objection if the accused is granted opportunity as directed by the Court of Sessions, however, he requests that timelines be fixed for the same.

6. The complaint was filed way back in the year 2015. The record indicates that the matter was heard twice by the Court and was reserved for judgment, however, it has still not been decided.

7. Considering that a limited relief has been sought by the petitioner, this Court does not consider it necessary to hear the respondent.

8. In view of the above, without going into the merits of the case, the concerned Trial Court is directed to expediate the disposal of the case. For the said purpose, the parties are directed to appear before the concerned Trial Court on 09.10.2025 for further proceedings.

9. The learned Trial Court is directed to fix a convenient date for hearing arguments.

10. The learned Trial Court is further requested not to grant unwarranted adjournments to any of the parties and make endeavour to dispose of the case expeditiously within a period of six months.

11. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.



12. Pending Application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 18, 2025
“SK”