



\$~53, 54 & 65

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

+ CRL.M.C. 9151/2025, CRL.M.A. 38254/2025 & 38255/2025

CRL.M.C. 9152/2025, CRL.M.A. 38256/2025 & 38257/2025

CRL.M.C. 9173/2025, CRL.M.A. 38320/2025

ANUJ SAYAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhinav Agnihotri, Mr. Nishant Gupta, Mr Rishabh Yadav and Mr. Akhilesh Kumar, Advs.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

22.12.2025

%

1. Three Petitions under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. have been filed on behalf of the Petitioner Anuj Sayal for quashing of FIR No.0404/2023 under Section 354A IPC; FIR No.0432/2023 under Section 509 IPC and FIR No.0386/2023 under Sections 354(A) and 354(D) IPC, all FIRs registered at PS: Sarita Vihar, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. It is submitted that the quashing has been sought on the ground that the FIRs have been filed to evade from the contractual obligation from returning the assets of the company and further creating a shield to protect the Complaint un-authorized misconduct done by her during her tenure. The Company had constituted an Internal Complaint Committee ('ICC') and initiated full POSH enquiry, which found no complaints filed by Respondent No.2 / Complainant during her tenure.



3. In the enquiry, evidence was collected from everyone and after thorough investigations, findings were given. Respondent No.2 was asked to join enquiry, but she refused. Without adhering to the procedure for conducting preliminary enquiry to ascertain the truthfulness of the allegations of the Complaint, the Committee has committed grave error. The nature of allegations is mala fide and does not contain any specific date of incident and no reason has been given for not reporting the alleged incident to any concerned officials of the Company or to any other member. FIR is therefore, liable to be quashed, as she did not mention any such incident in her resignation dated 07.06.2023, on the other hand, she thanked the Petitioner for the opportunity and for being supportive during her tenure in the Company of the Petitioner. The allegations have been made for the first time only after she was terminated.

4. It is a *mala fide* attempt on the part of the Complainant to settle the score with the Company. Complaint is allegedly in possession of the Company, such as laptop, smart-phone, tab, company mobile phone and other confidential information. She was already having knowledge that the confidential data being sensitive in order to blackmail the Company and to extort more money has filed present FIR. She has misused the confidential information entrusted to her.

5. No Chargesheet has been filed even after 1.5 year of alleged Complaint. No *prima facie* case is made out. The Petitions are therefore, filed for quashing of FIRs. Reliance is placed on State of Haryana vs. Bhajan Lal, AIR 1992 SC 604.

6. Learned APP for the State submits that investigations are almost complete and the Chargesheet is likely to be filed within 15 days. Though, the



Petitioner is claiming a bona fide in making the Complaint, but there are specific allegations in the Complaint of using inappropriate language and of her assault with specific dates.

7. Considering the specific allegations made in the Complaint, there is no case made out for quashing of FIRs, merely because there may be some office issue between the Complainant and Respondent No.2. Chargesheet is likely to be filed within 15 days, as stated by learned APP for the State.

8. In the circumstances, no case is made out for quashing of the FIRs in the light of specific allegations made in the Complaint.

9. All three Petitions along with pending Applications are dismissed.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

DECEMBER 22, 2025/R