



\$~67

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 1225/2026, CRL.M.A. 11783/2026 & 11784/2026**

JOGINDER SINGH KAUNDAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prakhar Bhatnagar, Mr. Akram
Pasha and Mr. Mohit Tyagi,
Advocates.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC with IO/ASI
Kapil.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER
17.04.2026

%

1. For ready reference, the prayer clause of this writ petition is extracted below:

“a) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari, thereby quashing and setting aside the impugned "Notice to Join Enquiry" dated 28.11.2025 bearing Complaint No. 1898/SHO/PS Ranhola, Delhi, issued by the officials of Police Station Ran hola, Outer District, Delhi, being wholly illegal, without jurisdiction and contrary to the provisions of law.

b) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus, thereby directing the Respondent No.1 not to take any coercive steps against the Petitioner pursuant to or in furtherance of the impugned notice or the alleged complaint, including repeated summoning of the Petitioner or any



interference with his peaceful possession of the subject property;

c) Direct the senior officials of the Respondent No.1 to conduct a disciplinary inquiry against the erring police officer who attempted to create a fabricated evidence by pasting the impugned notice on the walls of Petitioner's house, clicking it's picture and removing the pasted impugned notice immediately thereafter.

d) Direct the Respondent No. 1 to stop calling the Petitioner to the police station for the so called enquiry and close the enquiry as the so called disputes between Respondent No. 2 and the Petitioner are purely of civil nature.

e) Pass any other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, in the interest of justice”.

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that in the complaint lodged way back in November 2025, till date the enquiry prior to registration of FIR is continuing for which the petitioner is being repeatedly called by the IO. It is further submitted by learned counsel for petitioner that what is simply a civil dispute is being given colour of criminality, that too despite the fact that the complainant has not initiated any civil suit.

3. Learned ASC appearing with IO/ASI Kapil accepts notice.

4. The IO has shown me the enquiry file including the complaint on which the petitioner is being repeatedly called. Keeping in mind the stage, it would not be appropriate for this court to comment as to whether any cognizable offence is made out.

5. However, learned ASC on instructions of IO submits that they shall conclude the enquiry proceedings within four weeks during which they would question the petitioner once after directing him to produce specific documents.



6. Learned counsel for petitioner on instructions of his client submits that the petitioner is satisfied with the above said statement of learned ASC and therefore, seeks permission to withdraw this petition.

7. Accordingly, the petition and the accompanying applications are dismissed as withdrawn with the directions that the IO shall adhere to his above submission.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 17, 2026/ry