



\$~130

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

+ CRL.M.C. 668/2026

MOHD. AYYUB & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Archit Krishna, Mr. Anirudh Ramanathan, Mr. Abdul Gaffar, Mr. Salim Malik, Ms. Shavana, Ms. Tamanna Pankaj, Mr. Indronil Choudhry, Mr. Ashutosh Shukla, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Prasad, SPP with Insp. Gurmeet, Crime Branch.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **27.01.2026**

CRL.M.C. 668/2026 & CRL.M.A. 2661/2026 (ex-parte ad-interim relief)

1. The petitioners have approached this Court under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking directions for preservation of the CCTV footage dated 20.01.2026, recorded between 09:30 AM and 12:30 PM, pertaining to the cameras installed outside and in the vicinity of Court Room No. 56, Second Floor, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.
2. The petitioners are accused in Sessions Case No. 119/2020, arising out of FIR No. 60/2020 registered at Police Station Dayalpur, for offences punishable under Sections 186, 353, 332, 323, 109, 144, 147,



148, 149, 153A, 188, 333, 336, 427, 307, 308, 397, 412, 302, 201, 120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, read with Sections 3 and 4 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984, and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

3. It is the petitioners' case that, while appearing before the Trial Court for the purpose of recording of prosecution evidence, they observed the Investigating Officer – Inspector Gurmeet Singh, standing outside the courtroom in the company of a prospective prosecution witness, namely HC Sunil, and allegedly indicating towards the accused persons present. The petitioners apprehend that the said conduct was with a view to facilitating prior identification by the proposed witness, whose examination was fixed for 22.01.2026. It is further submitted, on instructions, that the examination of the said witness was not conducted on the said date.

4. By the impugned order dated 20.01.2026, the learned Sessions Court dismissed the petitioners' application seeking preservation of the relevant CCTV footage, recording *inter alia* that similar allegations had been raised on earlier occasions, and that the accused had already been directed to keep their faces muffled before entering the courtroom.

5. During the course of hearing, Mr. Archit Krishna, learned counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Amit Prasad, learned Special Public Prosecutor appearing for the State, submitted that, at this stage, this Court may direct preservation of the relevant CCTV footage, while leaving it open to the parties to raise their respective submissions in that regard before the Sessions Court.

6. Mr. Krishna further submitted that the petitioners intend to move



an appropriate application before the Trial Court for taking the CCTV footage on record. Mr. Prasad, however, submitted that the Sessions Court may, if it so deems fit, examine the CCTV footage on its own, and that no further directions are warranted at this stage.

7. For the present, it is directed that the CCTV footage dated 20.01.2026, recorded between 09:30 AM and 12:30 PM, particularly from the cameras installed outside and in the vicinity of Court Room No. 56, Second Floor, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, shall be preserved, subject to further orders to be passed by the Sessions Court.

8. The parties are at liberty to raise their respective submissions and/or move appropriate applications before the Sessions Court prior to the next date of hearing.

9. The petition is accordingly disposed of in the above terms.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 27, 2026

“Bhupi”/SD/