



\$~31 & 32

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

W.P.(CRL) 3904/2024, CRL.M.A. 37687/2024 (stay)

AMIT CHATURVEDI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Kumar Sharma,
Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION & ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Anubha Bhardwaj, SPP CBI,
Ms. Ananya Shamsbery, Ms. Anchal
Kashypa, Mr. Vijay Misra along with
Inspector Manish Kesari, IO, CBI.
Mr. Sarfaraz Khan, Advocate for
R2/UCO Bank.

32

+ W.P.(CRL) 3908/2024, CRL.M.A. 37725/2024 (stay)

SANJAY CHATURVEDI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Kumar Sharma,
Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION & ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Anubha Bhardwaj, SPP CBI,
Ms. Ananya Shamsbery, Ms. Anchal
Kashypa, Mr. Vijay Misra along with
Inspector Manish Kesari, IO, CBI.
Mr. Sarfaraz Khan, Advocate for
R2/UCO Bank.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

21.11.2025

%

1. Writ Petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with
Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter referred*



to as 'Cr.PC')/Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*hereinafter referred to as 'B.N.S.S.'*), have been filed on behalf of the Petitioners, for quashing of FIR No. RC.BD1/2009/E/0008 of 2009 under Section 120B read with Section 420/468/471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*hereinafter referred to as 'IPC'*), and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(D) PC Act, 1988 dated 08.04.2009 and Charge Sheet dated 01.06.2010 under Section 120B read with Section 420/468/471 of IPC and Section 13(1)(D) PC Act, 1988, in view of the One Time Settlement dated 02.05.2019/07.05.2019 arrived at between M/s Dwarkadhish Spinners Limited (DSL) and its Guarantors and the Respondent No.2.

2. It is submitted that the matters have been duly settled with the Complainant Bank and the entire outstanding dues have been cleared. It is, therefore, submitted that the said FIR is liable to be quashed.

3. Learned counsel on behalf of the CBI, has filed a Reply taking an objection to the quashing on the ground that the Bank *vide* its Letter dated 02.05.2019, has stated that the compromise proposal for Settlement of dues from M/s Dwarkadhish Spinners Limited (DSL), has been approved but the criminal proceedings may be continued.

4. Learned counsel for the CBI, therefore, opposes the quashing.

5. It is also pointed out by learned counsel for CBI that the matters are now pending at the stage of defence evidence, before the learned Trial Court.

6. Learned counsel on behalf of the UCO Bank also reinforces that the Settlement is only in respect of the civil liability and not the criminal offence.

7. Reliance is also placed on Anil Bhavarial Jain and Another vs. State



of Maharashtra and Others, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 3823 wherein it has been held that even if the matter has been settled before the DRT and the amounts have been paid but the public interest would be hampered if the PC Act Case, is quashed. It would have grave and substantial impact not only on the parties involved but also on the Society at large.

8. Learned counsel for the Petitioner on the other hand, has submitted that there are various Apex Court Judgments where in the similar situation, the FIR has been quashed. Reliance has been placed on *Lalit Kishore and Others vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another*, 2024 SCC OnLine Del 5792.

Submissions heard and the record perused.

9. The Apex Court in the Case of *Anil Bhavarial Jain and Another* (supra) has clearly observed that such FIR invoking the PC Act, must not be quashed. Furthermore, the entire trial already stands concluded and the cases are at the stage of defence evidence.

10. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, no case is made out for quashing of the said FIR.

11. The Petitions are dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Pending Application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

NOVEMBER 21, 2025/RS