



\$~60

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3377/2026**

MEENU RATHORE & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Gagan Puri, Mr. Gautam Matoria,
Mr. Chirag Dagar, Mr. Varun Rana,
Mr. Anshul Lamba, Mr. Dev Chawla
and Mr. Mayank Sharma, Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for
State/R-1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

%

04.05.2026

CRL.M.A. 13651/2026 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 3377/2026 & CRL.M.A. 13652/2026 (for interim stay)

1. Petitioner herein had filed a complaint before the concerned Magisterial Court and also prayed for registration of FIR and investigation by moving an application under Section 175 (3) of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*. Such application was allowed and the learned Magisterial Court, *vide* order dated 23.03.2026, directed registration of FIR with the further direction that investigating officer would be an officer, not below the rank of ACP.

2. Such order was challenged by the proposed accused by filing a revision petition which was registered as Criminal Revision No. 143/2026. Said

CRL.M.C. 3377/2026

1



revision petition was taken up by learned Revisional Court on 01.04.2026 and the learned Revisional Court directed the stay of operation of impugned order.

3. Grievance of the complainant is two-fold.

4. He submits that a very long date has been given by the learned Trial Court and the impugned order has been stayed while being unmindful of the fact that FIR has already been registered. He also submits that same order was earlier challenged by the State also as it was aggrieved by the direction regarding investigation to be carried out by an officer not below the rank of ACP and such revision petition i.e. CR No. 146/2026 was disposed of by another the learned Revisional Court and, therefore, by implication the order of the Magisterial Court had been affirmed. According to him, the stay order granted by learned Revisional Court is causing serious prejudice to the complainant.

5. On the basis of request made to learned counsel for petitioners to contact the counsel for respondent Nos. 2 to 7, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 to 7 appears and submits that they had invoked revisional jurisdiction prior to the invocation of the same by the State and they had approached the learned Revisional Court, even prior to registration of FIR.

6. Next date before learned Revisional Court is stated to be 12.08.2026.

7. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that he would not press the present petition if there is a direction to learned Revisional Court to take up the aforesaid revision petition, as expeditiously as possible, and to decide the same in a time-bound manner.

8. Learned Addl. P.P. for State and learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 to 7 submit that they would render their best co-operation and assistance in this regard to learned Revisional Court.



9. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case and aforesaid statement made by the learned counsel for petitioner, *albeit*, with expressing any opinion over the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with request to learned Revisional Court to dispose of aforesaid revision petition i.e. CR No. 143/2026, as expeditiously as possible and preferably by 15.07.2026.

10. Needless to say, the learned Revisional Court shall prepone the date of hearing and would also give requisite opportunity of hearing to all the sides.

11. A copy of this order be sent to learned Revisional Court for information and due compliance.

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

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 4, 2026/dr/sy