



\$~49

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 8282/2025, CRL.M.A. 34519/2025 (for direction)**

RAVINDER SONI

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Anubhav Tyagi, Advocate.**

versus

STATE(NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for the State
with SI Shruti Dubey and SI Anjali
Rathi DIU, Central District.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

20.11.2025

CRL.M.A.34520/2025 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 8282/2025

3. The Petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS'*), has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner, to challenge the Order dated 20.09.2025 of the learned ASJ, FTSC (POCSO)-02/Central, Tis Hazari Court in SC No. 229/2025 arising out of FIR No. 154/2025 under Section 74/75 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 4 of POCSO Act, registered at Police Station Nabi Karim.
4. It is a composite Order dated 20.09.2025 by which, the Application



for discharge of the Applicant and also his Application under Section 94 BNSS read with Section 39(2) of the Bharatiya Sakshaya Adhiniyam, for production of DVR, have been dismissed.

5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, at the outset submits that his Petition is confined to the challenge to the Order under Section 94 BNSS and he shall be challenging the Order dismissing his Application under Section 250 BNSS, by way of separate Criminal Revision.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, has referred to various Orders of the learned Trial Court passed during the investigations in respect of the DVR, which was installed in the house of the Petitioner, to show his presence in his house, which is exonerating him from the allegations of commission of the offence.

7. It is submitted that the said recording in pen drive, was submitted to the Investigating Officer on 21.02.2025 and it forms the part of the Charge-Sheet. It is asserted that the authenticity of his pen drive, has not been verified by the Prosecution and the benefit of the same is not being extended to the Applicant. It is, therefore, submitted that vide the Impugned Order dated 20.09.2025, his Application for placing on record the DVR/Hard Disk of the CCTV cameras installed at his residence for the relevant period including 02.02.2025 and 07.02.2025, directly before the Court and to place the said CCTV footage as mentioned in the Seizure Memo of DVR of Applicant, directly before the Court and also to direct the Investigating Officer; to play the CCTV footage stored in the DVR of the Applicant, before this Court be allowed. Further, direction be given to the Investigating Officer/SHO, to verify the storage capacity of Hard Disc, colour and name of company, serial number etc. of the DVR.



8. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submits that the Petitioner has filed 13 Petitions against the Police Officials of Police Station Nabi Karim about the corruption and supporting the builders in the jurisdiction of Police Station Nabi Karim.

9. The various Orders have been pointed out by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner. He has submitted that this CCTV recording was played by the Applicant, before the Court while addressing arguments on his Bail Application on 20.02.2025. Thereafter, on 21.02.2025, he had handed over the recording in a pen drive, which was seized by the Investigating Officer. The submission of the Petitioner, coupled with the record, shows that despite repeated directions of the Court, as well as, the Investigating Officer, the Petitioner chose not to submit the original DVR on record. The matter is now at the stage of Prosecution evidence. The learned Trial Court has rightly observed that now this original DVR, which is sought to be produced by the Applicant, at the stage of Prosecution evidence, may be produced by the Applicant in his defence or in confronting the Prosecution witnesses, in accordance with law.

10. The learned Addl. PP has submitted that Petitioner is a bad character and an extortionist, who is a habitual and vexatious litigator, who files Writ Petition against various Builders etc. to extort money. It is further submitted that during the investigations, despite specific directions, he refused to hand over the DVR by asserting that he had no faith in the Police of Nabi Karim. Consequently, the investigations were transferred to DIU/C but thereto, the original DVR was not submitted by the Petitioner, despite repeated directions by the Court and Notices by the Investigating Officer.

11. The Charge-Sheet now already stands filed and the matter is pending



at the stage of Prosecution evidence. At this belated stage, the Petitioner cannot be permitted to file a document for verification by the Police. It has been rightly observed by the learned Trial Court in the Impugned Order that the said DVR may be produced by the Accused, during the trial, in accordance with law. It is, therefore, submitted that this Application has no merit and is liable to be rejected.

12. There is no merit in the present Petition, which is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Pending Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

NOVEMBER 20, 2025/RS