



\$~67

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7381/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30972/2025,**
CRL.M.A. 30973/2025

KARTIK GUPTA AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Siddharth Mittal, Ms.
Shilpa G. Mittal, Mr.
Abhijeet Varshney & Mr.
Sumit K. Sharma, Advs.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP
for the State.
ASI Anil & ASI Sarai
Rohilla.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

16.10.2025

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 624/2022 dated 08.10.2022, registered at Police Station Sarai Rohilla, for the offences under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Petitioner No.2 is the sister-in-law of Respondent No.2 and Petitioner No.1 is Petitioner No.2's husband. He submits that the petitioners are distant relatives of Respondent No.2 and they have been falsely implicated in the FIR on the basis of vague allegations with the ulterior motive of wreaking vengeance.

3. On being asked, it is informed that the petitioners have already preferred a discharge application before the learned Trial



Court, which is still pending consideration. Undisputably, the petitioners have the remedy of addressing arguments and raising all issues before the learned Trial Court while arguing on charge. Moreover, it is pertinent to note that the FIR was registered way back in the year 2022 and the chargesheet was also filed in July, 2024. It is not the case of the petitioner that he had approached the High Court seeking quashing of the FIR at the very inception.

4. While this Court is empowered to quash criminal proceedings even after filing of chargesheet to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of law, it is well settled that ordinarily, this Court should be cautious to exercise inherent jurisdiction and interfere with the proceedings after chargesheet has been filed after thorough investigation [Ref. ***State of Odisha v. Pratima Mohanty and Others: (2022) 16 SCC 703***].

5. *Prima facie*, there appears to be some merit in the case of the petitioners, however, at this stage, this Court does not consider it apposite to entertain the present petition.

6. At this juncture, a request is made that the petitioners may be exempted from personal appearance before the learned Trial Court and the proceedings in the matter may be expedited.

7. Considering that the matter pertains to the year 2022, the learned Trial Court is requested to make endeavours to proceed with the matter expeditiously. Furthermore, as and when any application is moved by the petitioners seeking exemption from personal appearance, the same is directed to be considered sympathetically.

8. The present petition is dismissed in the aforesaid terms with liberty to the petitioner to raise all arguments and issues



before the learned Trial Court while addressing arguments on charge. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

9. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court in case any grievance remains in future.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 16, 2025
“SK”