



\$~50

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
% *Date of Decision: 11th February, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 2162/2025

VISHAL EXPORTS OVERSEAS LTD & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Suryakant Singla, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Shanto Mukerjee, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONRespondent

Through: Mr. Anupam S. Sharrma, SPP for CBI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

CRL.M.A. 4676/2026 (for early hearing)

1. Since learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners and learned SPP for CBI are present today, with their consent, the matter has been taken up today itself.
2. The application is allowed.
3. The next date of 14.05.2026 stands cancelled.

CRL.M.C. 2162/2025

4. Petitioners have been charged under Section 420 and 471 IPC *vide* order dated 29.04.2024.
5. At the time of hearing arguments on charge, one of the prime contentions coming from the side of the petitioners was to the effect that the Courts at Delhi had no jurisdiction. However, such contention was not considered, which compelled the petitioners to file a Revision Petition.
6. The Revisional Court also affirmed the abovesaid order dated 29.04.2024.



7. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners submits that though a specific contention and ground of ‘absence of jurisdiction’ was taken in the Revision Petition and oral arguments were also advanced, there is no discussion with respect to jurisdictional aspect even in the impugned order dated 28.01.2025 whereby the ‘order on charge’ has been upheld.

8. Mr. Anupam S. Sharrma, learned SPP for CBI submits that the Courts at Delhi have jurisdiction and, moreover, in terms of Section 462 Cr.P.C. (corresponding Section 508 BNSS, 2023), they cannot make grievance with respect to the jurisdiction, unless they are able to demonstrate failure of justice by facing trial in Delhi. He also submits that the aspect of territorial jurisdiction, does not, even otherwise, go to the root of the matter. However, he, in all fairness, submits that since the aspect of jurisdiction has not been considered by the learned Revisional Court, as per the request made by learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner, he would have no objection if the matter is remanded and learned Revisional Court is requested to reconsider the Revision Petition and to decide the same afresh.

9. Keeping in mind the overall facts and with the consent of both the sides, the petition is disposed of with request to learned Revisional Court to take up Crl.Rev.35/2024 afresh and after hearing arguments from both the sides, to dispose that of, while also answering about the aspects related to territorial jurisdiction.

10. Needless to say, in view of the aforesaid, order dated 28.01.2025 stands set aside.

11. It is, however, made clear that this Court has not made any observation with respect to jurisdictional aspect and it will be entirely upto the learned Revisional Court to consider the same and to decide the same, in accordance



with law.

12. Parties would appear before the learned Revisional Court on 25.02.2026 at 2:00 pm.

13. A copy of order be sent by the Registry to learned Revisional Court for information and compliance.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 11, 2026
st/js