



\$~41

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 24th February, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 1509/2026 & CRL.M.A. 6090/2026 & CRL.M.A. 6091/2026

VENUGOPAL N DHOOT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajneesh Sharma and Mr. Anil Pandey, Advocates.

versus

RELIGARE FINVEST LIMITED & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hemant Kumar and Mr. Bhavishya Mohaniya, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

JUDGMENT (oral)

1. Petitioner is defending a complaint filed under Section 138 of *Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881* and challenges order dated 06.02.2026 whereby the learned Trial Court, while dismissing his application seeking exemption from personal appearance, has directed issuance of *Non-Bailable Warrants* against him.

2. As per the contents of the abovesaid application, whereby the petitioner had sought exemption from his personal appearance, the petitioner, a man in his seventies, is resident of Mumbai and is suffering from multiple health problems having undergone *Coronary Angioplasty* and there is insertion of many *stents* in his artery and, it was in the abovesaid background, that he had moved said application seeking his exemption from personal appearance for



that day only.

3. Learned counsel for respondent/complainant appears on advance notice and, in all fairness, submits that he would not insist for issuance of coercive process. He, however, submits that let petitioner move appropriate application seeking his exemption from personal appearance, duly supported with an affidavit clearly specifying therein that he would not dispute his identity and would be duly represented through counsel. He, however, submits that his such concession may not be construed as if he has granted any no objection to any such request. He reserves his rights to oppose the same.

4. He also, however, submits that the petitioner should come up with some amicable solution of the complaint, which is pending for quite for some time.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that he would also take appropriate instructions from his client and would apprise the learned Trial Court within two weeks, as to whether the matter can be amicably resolved or not.

6. The present petition is, accordingly, disposed of in aforesaid terms and the order dated 06.02.2026, whereby the warrants have been issued against the applicant, is re-called.

7. Petitioner is given liberty to move appropriate application afresh and, after seeking response if any from the complainant, it will be entirely up to the learned Trial Court to decide such application seeking exemption, in accordance with law.

8. Needless to say, learned Trial Court would also keep in mind the provisions of *Electronic Evidence and Video Conferencing Rules, 2025* while considering any such application.



9. The petitioner would also apprise the learned Trial Court, as well as learned counsel for complainant as to whether the matter can be amicably resolved or not, and if there is any such possibility, the learned Trial Court would be at liberty to refer them to mediation.

10. It is, however, clarified that the present order would not prejudice the mind of the Court while considering the proposed application.

11. The petitioner is, however, exempted from personal appearance for 25.02.2026. His counsel would, though, represent him.

12. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 24, 2026/ss/pb