



\$~54

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2574/2026, CRL.M.A. 10470/2026

JASPREET KAUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rana S. Biswas, Mr. Kartik Chettiar and Mr. Yash Tripathi, Advocates.

versus

JAGJEET SINGH & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Raghuinder Verma, APP for the State with Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh, Advocate
SI Mandeep Kumar, PS-Tilak Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

07.04.2026

CRL.M.A. 10471/2026 (*for condonation of 9 days delay in re-filing*)

1. By virtue of the present application, the petitioner seeks condonation of a delay of *nine days* in re-filing the present petition.
2. Taking into account the period for which condonation of delay is sought, the application is, for the reasons stated therein, allowed and the delay of *nine days* in re-filing the present petition is condoned.
3. The application is disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 2574/2026 & CRL.M.A. 10470/2026

4. By virtue of the present petition under *Section 528* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (***BNSS***), the petitioner seeks setting aside of the order dated 15.12.2025 (***impugned order***) passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, West District, Tis Hazari Courts,



Delhi (***learned Principal Judge***) in T.P. No.66/2025 and transfer of M.C. No.581/2023 from the Court of the learned JMFC (Mahila Court)-02, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi (***learned Trial Court***) to another competent Court on the ground of alleged bias.

5. At the outset, this Court finds that the petitioner is once again trying to re-agitate the very same issues which have already been negated by a well-reasoned speaking impugned order by the learned Principal Judge. In fact, a perusal thereof reflects that the impugned order has been passed after taking into consideration not only the factual matrix involved, but also the settled legal position as well. The impugned order also reflects that all the (similar) contentions raised by the petitioner in the present petition *qua* the alleged bias of the learned Trial Court have, in fact, been elaborately rejected by the learned Principal Judge, and it has been categorically held that mere discharge of the husband and mother-in-law of the petitioner *vide* the order on charge dated 28.06.2025 could not form any basis to assume bias, as the onus was on the petitioner to substantiate her claims with material particulars.

6. Even otherwise, since the said order(s) were passed by a Court of law in discharge of the duties, merely because it was not a favourable order in favour of the petitioner does/ cannot involve an element of bias, all the more whence it is always open for the petitioner to take recourse to the appropriate remedies as available to her in accordance with law. In fact, this Court is apprised by learned counsel for petitioner that the petitioner has already taken recourse to appropriate remedy as available in accordance with law by challenging the said order of discharge by way a separate proceeding.



7. At the end of the day, since there are no other facts asserted, issues, reasons and grounds raised and/ or arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner before this Court, and which have not been conclusively answered by the learned Principal Judge there is no reason for this Court to issue notice in this petitioner so as to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction under *Section 528 BNSS* to interfere with the impugned order.

8. In view of the aforesaid, the present petition, being without any merit, is dismissed *in limine*.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

APRIL 07, 2026/NA