



\$~73

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 7160/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30077/2025 INTERIM
DIRECTIONS, CRL.M.A. 30078/2025 EXEMPTION FROM
FILING COMPLAINT DATED 21.07.2025

ROMI GARG

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jai Sahai Endlaw, Ms.
Shambhavi Kala, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastav, APP.
Dr. L.S. Chaudhar, Dr. Ajay
Chaudhary, Mr. Bharat Chaudhary,
Ms. Vinita, Ms. Monika Chaudhary,
Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER
09.10.2025

%

CRL.M.C. 7160/2025

1. The petitioner has preferred the present petition seeking quashing of complaint dated 21.07.2025 filed by the respondent no. 2 with the Economic Offences Wing of respondent no. 1 and all proceedings arising therefrom.
2. The Ld. Counsel submits that respondent no. 2 is the mother of the petitioner, who is under the influence of the petitioner's brother Anup Garg, with whom the petitioner has various disputes, *inter alia* relating to immovable properties. It is stated that the complaint arises out of one such dispute pertaining to properties being basement, ground floor and first floor



of A-1, Greater Kailash Enclave-II, New Delhi and N-118, Greater Kailash-I, New Delhi which is subject matter of the civil suit filed by the petitioner being CS (OS) 626/2025 titled “*Mr. Romi Garg Vs. Mrs. Sheela Devi & Ors*” which is currently pending before the High Court.

3. It has been stated that the allegations raised in the complaint by respondent no. 2 were also raised before the High Court in CS (OS) 626/2025 but this Court passed an order maintaining *status quo* with regard to the basement, ground floor and first floor of A-1, Greater Kailash Enclave-II, New Delhi and further restrained respondent no. 2 and Anup Garg from creating third parties rights with respect to N-118, Greater Kailash-I, New Delhi.

4. It is further submitted that the complaint dated 21.07.2025 is actuated by malice inasmuch as respondent no. 2 is acting under influence and control of Anup Garg who has threatened the petitioner that he will get 25 FIRs registered against him under various pretexts.

5. It is also submitted that on 22.09.2025, the petitioner was unlawfully and illegally arrested at the behest of Anup Garg and his associates under Sections 107/151 Cr.P.C. and the SHO threatened him that unless he withdraws CS (OS) 626/2025 he would be sent behind bars. The petitioner was set free only after he approached the High Court by way of *Habeas Corpus* petition.

6. It is argued that a bare reading of the complaint reveals that the same is in respect of a civil dispute which is already subject matter for CS (OS) 626/2025 and the same is being given the colour of criminality at the behest of Anup Garg. It is argued that the complaint is motivated and has been filed with mala fide intent to harass the petitioner and misuse the machinery of



law to settle the personal scores.

7. The Ld. APP who appears for the State submits that no FIR has been registered so far and the complaint is still under inquiry and that applicant has been joined for the purpose of inquiry.

8. Since, as of now police is still inquiring into the complaint filed by the respondent no. 2, it may not be appropriate to close the inquiry proceedings at this stage. The petitioner shall not suffer any prejudice merely because the police are inquiring into the complaint filed by the respondent no. 2.

9. In my view the petition is premature and there is no compelling reason to quash the complaint.

10. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

OCTOBER 9, 2025/lks