



\$~57 to 59

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 274/2026 & CRL.M.A. 1019-1020/2026**
BHANU CHOUDHRIE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Trideep Pais, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Sahiba Singh, Mr. Madhav
Kumar, Ms. Sakshi Jain and Ms.
Saloni, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for the
State with SI Ashok Kumar.
Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Manu Sharma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Madhu Sudan, Mr. Vikhyat
Oberoi, Mr. Ilam R., Mr. Ankit
Kakkar, Ms. Shreya Sethi, Mr. Fazal
Haroon and Mr. Shivam Prakash, Ms.
Deepti Mehra and Mr. Chaitenya and
Mr. Kartikay Mehta, Advocates for
R-2.

+ **CRL.M.C. 275/2026 & CRL.M.A. 1024-1025/2026**
BHANU CHOUDHRIE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Trideep Pais, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Sahiba Singh, Mr. Madhav
Kumar, Ms. Sakshi Jain and Ms.
Saloni, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for the



State with SI Ashok Kumar.

Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Manu Sharma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Madhu Sudan, Mr. Vikhyat
Oberoi, Mr. Ilam R., Mr. Ankit
Kakkar, Ms. Shreya Sethi, Mr. Fazal
Haroon and Mr. Shivam Prakash, Ms.
Deepti Mehra and Mr. Chaitenya and
Mr. Kartikay Mehta, Advocates for
R-2.

+ CRL.M.C. 276/2026 & CRL.M.A. 1026-1027/2026
BHANU CHOUDHRIE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Trideep Pais, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Sahiba Singh, Mr. Madhav
Kumar, Ms. Sakshi Jain and Ms.
Saloni, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for the
State with SI Ashok Kumar.
Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Manu Sharma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Madhu Sudan, Mr. Vikhyat
Oberoi, Mr. Ilam R., Mr. Ankit
Kakkar, Ms. Shreya Sethi, Mr. Fazal
Haroon and Mr. Shivam Prakash, Ms.
Deepti Mehra and Mr. Chaitenya and
Mr. Kartikay Mehta, Advocates for
R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

13.01.2026

%

1. All the three matters have been taken up together.



2. The petitioner herein had filed three separate complaints, and in all such complaints, there was request for registration of FIR.
3. The learned Magisterial Court, *vide* separate orders passed on 19.12.2025, allowed applications filed under Section 175 (3) of BNSS, and directed the concerned SHO to register FIR and to carry out investigation in all such three matters.
4. All such orders were challenged by respondent No.2 herein by filing separate revision petitions before the Court of Sessions. These were registered as Revision Petition Nos.770/2025, 771/2025 and 772/2025.
5. When these revision petitions were taken up by the learned Court of Sessions, while issuing notice, the learned Court directed the stay of the impugned order regarding registration of the FIR. Admittedly, FIR had not been registered, by them.
6. The petitioner, who is complainant before the learned Magisterial Court, has taken exception to the abovesaid order(s) whereby registration of the FIR has been put on hold. The prime contention is that registration of FIR was stayed, without assigning any cogent or compelling reason.
7. The next date before the learned Revisional Court is stated to be 24.01.2026.
8. Learned Senior Counsel for respondent No.2 appear on advance notice and oppose the present petitions. They, however, on instructions, and while reserving all their rights and contentions, assure that they would extend their best cooperation to the learned Revisional Court for expedited disposal of the abovesaid revisions petitions while reserving all his rights and contentions.
9. After hearing arguments for some time, learned Senior Counsel for petitioner, on instructions and, without prejudice to their rights and



contentions and on said assurance, does not press the present petitions.

10. All the three petitions stand disposed of as not pressed.

11. All rights and contentions of parties are reserved.

12. Learned Revisional Court is also requested to give priority to all the abovesaid three petitions and to make best endeavour to dispose those of within a period of four weeks from the next date of hearing. Needless to say, both the sides would render their best assistance and cooperation to the learned Revisional Court so that the petitions are disposed of, in aforesaid terms.

MANOJ JAIN, J

JANUARY 13, 2026/ss/pb