



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

%

*Reserved on: 15th December, 2025
Pronounced on: 20th February, 2026*

+

CRL.M.C. 831/2021

SMT. REEMA ARORA

W/o Sh. Vijay Arora,
R/o Flat No.23, Pocket-9,
Sector-25, Rohini, Delhi.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. M. L. Yadav and Mr. Prashant
Advocates.

versus

1. STATE NCT OF DELHI

2. SH. UTTAM CHAND MEENA

S/o Gyani Ram Meena,
R/o 17-D.D.A. MIG Flats,
Vikas Niketan, North Extension,
Near Agrasen Dharamshala,
Pitampura, New Delhi.

3. SH. MAHINDER SINGH (POLICE OFFICIAL)

Post in Delhi Police
Mob. 9812014380

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib, Haider, APP for State
with SI Satish Kumar and SI Lal
Chand, PS: S.B. Dairy.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

J U D G M E N T

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.



1. Petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter referred to as 'Cr.P.C.'*) has been filed on behalf of the **Petitioner, Reema Arora**, to challenge the Order dated 07.12.2019 *vide* which learned ASJ has upheld the Order of learned MM dated 22.01.2019, dismissing the Complaint of the Petitioner under Section 200 Cr.P.C.
2. ***The brief facts of the case*** are that Petitioner / Complainant, Reema Arora filed Complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C. against the Respondents for offences under Sections 307/511/323/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*hereinafter referred to as 'IPC'*).
3. The Petitioner submitted that she has been residing at the given address in *Sector 25, Rohini* with her family members. On 09.09.2009, a PCR Van came to her house and asked her to accompany them to Police Station. She along with her son, went to the Police Station, where Respondent / *Uttam Chand Meena* and his wife, *Gargi Meena* were already present. One Sub-Inspector started threatening the Petitioner / Complainant and asked her to get out and no quarrel took place in the Police Station.
4. After returning from Police Station, Respondent / Uttam Chand Meena came near Complainant's house and started abusing her and extended threats to her to withdraw the case, which was fixed for 15.10.2009. When Complainant refused to do so, he grappled with her; in the meantime, *Gargi Meena* poured kerosene oil on the body of the Complainant. She raised hue and cry, on which her son and neighbours, gathered there. She was taken to B.S.A. Hospital, *Sector-6, Rohini* in Emergency Ward, where she was medically examined and her statement was recorded by Police.



5. Complainant further asserted in her Complaint that Respondent No.2 / *Uttam Chand Meena*, his wife *Gargi Meena* and Respondent No.3 / *Mahender Singh, Police Official*, came to her house and compelled her to become an agent of a Company namely R.C.M. and they took Rs.6,000/- from her, but neither her money was refunded nor any goods were given to her, against that payment made. Complainant apprehended danger at the hands of the Respondent / *Uttam Chand Meena* and his wife, *Gargi Meena*, as local Police failed to take any action against them, despite her Complaint.
6. The Complainant demanded her money from the accused persons, but they refused to do so. No action was taken on her Complaints to the Higher Authorities; hence, she filed present Complaint against the Respondents.
7. Learned MM, *vide* Order dated 28.09.2010, dismissed the Complainant's Application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C., but the matter was listed for evidence of the Complainant.
8. In support of her case, she examined herself as ***CW-1. She also examined CW-2, Smt. Neeru Madan***, Record Clerk Doctor from BSA Hospital who proved her MLC dated 09.09.2009.
9. Learned MM, after appreciating the evidence, concluded that there was no sufficient material to accept the allegations of Complainant and dismissed the Complaint, *vide* Order dated 22.01.2019.
10. ***Revision Petition bearing No.79/2019*** was preferred by the Complainant before the Court of Sessions. Learned ASJ considered the evidence and held that there was no infirmity in the Order of learned MM and consequently dismissed the Revision Petition.



11. Aggrieved by the Order of learned MM, which was upheld by learned ASJ, present Petition has been filed, wherein the grounds of challenge are that it has not been considered that in the year 2009, Accused had visited the Complainant / Petitioner and her family members and had offered a scheme of R.C.M, for which they had taken Rs.6,000/- from the Complainant with promise to give a receipt and some goods after few days, as per scheme.

12. Complainant has been requesting accused persons to refund those Rs.6,000/-, but neither money was returned nor any goods were delivered; instead they have been threatening the Complainant to implicate her in false and frivolous criminal cases.

13. It has further not been appreciated that while Complainant was brushing her teeth, Respondent / Uttam Chand Meena had come to her house and threatened her to withdraw the case and also abused her. He even grappled with Complainant, while his wife, *Gargi Meena* poured kerosene oil on her. This fact is corroborated by MLC, which has been proved by CW-2. The Statement of Complainant and her witness, has not been considered.

14. Therefore, a prayer is made that impugned Order of learned ASJ dated 07.12.2019 in Revision Petition No.79/2019 and Order of learned MM dated 22.01.2019, be set aside.

15. Written Synopsis have also been filed by the Petitioner, essentially reiterating the grounds raised in the Petitioner.

16. A Reply has been filed on behalf of Respondent No.3, Mahender Singh wherein the averments made by the Petitioner, are vehemently



opposed. It is submitted that the Respondent has never been known to or met with the Petitioner and her family members, in any manner whatsoever. The Petitioner has sought to implicate the Respondent with *mala fide* intention. It is further submitted that the Respondent has no connection with any R.C.M scheme, nor there was any occasion for receiving any alleged amount of Rs. 6,000/- or any part thereof or to make any promise.

17. Furthermore, it is denied that the Petitioner apprehended danger at the hands of the Respondents. The Respondent has never been posted at P.S. Shahbad Dairy nor was he involved in making any alleged *Kalandra*.

18. It is submitted that the averments are vague, bald and hold no merit. *Hence, the present Petition is liable to be dismissed.*

Submissions heard and record perused.

19. In the instant case, the core allegations made by the Complainant are that the Respondent / Uttam Chand Meena had abused and threatened her to withdraw the case, which was fixed for 15.10.2019, and his wife, Gargi Meena had poured kerosene oil on her. When the Complainant raised hue and cry, they both ran away and she was taken to the B.S.A. Hospital, where her MLC Ex. CW-1/A, was prepared.

20. A perusal of the MLC reveals that there was no injury specified by the examining Doctor, which could support the assertion of assault, as claimed by the Complainant. Moreover, alleged incident had taken place at 09:00 AM, while Complaint was lodge at 12:35 PM, i.e. after delay of about 3.5 hours. This delay remains unexplained by the Complainant, as observed by the learned MM.



21. Furthermore, the MLC reflects that she was taken to the Hospital by her husband. The presence of her husband, at the spot and any step taken by him to confront the accused persons at the time of alleged assault, had not been mentioned. The husband, has also not been examined to corroborate the facts. No independent neighbour or eyewitness has been produced, despite the assertion that neighbours had gathered upon hearing alarm of the alleged incident.

22. With respect to the allegation of payment of Rs.6,000/- for participation in an R.C.M. scheme, the Complaint lacks material particulars. Neither the date of payment, nor the manner of payment, nor any documentary evidence, receipt or communication has been placed on record. There is also no specification of the date(s) on which refund, was allegedly demanded.

23. Learned MM, rightly observed that the allegations regarding the payment of Rs.6,000/- were vague and not supported by any specifics such as date of payment or dates on which the alleged payment was demanded. Even the representations made by the Complainant to various authorities, also do not mention any date. The backdrop of the dispute, i.e. money being demanded from her by the Respondent, is also not corroborated by any independent material.

24. It is settled law that at the stage of taking cognizance on a Complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C., the Magistrate must be satisfied that sufficient grounds exist for proceeding. The existence of mere vague allegations, unsupported by *prima facie* material, does not mandate the summoning of the accused. The learned MM has rightly dismissed the Complaint of the



Petitioner as not disclosing any *prima facie* offence, which has been rightly upheld by learned ASJ.

25. There is no merit in the present Petition, which is hereby, **dismissed** along with pending Applications.

(NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 20, 2026/R