



\$~133

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

+ **TR.P.(CRL.) 45/2026**

SUNIL JAIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prateek Som, Mr. Aditya
Shukla, Mr. Chaitanya Tripathi &
Mr. Jalaj Sharma, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP
for State.
Insp. Vinay Kumar, Crime Branch.
Mr. Aditya Kaushik, Advocate for
R-7.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

19.05.2026

CRL.M.A. 16148/2026 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

TR.P.(CRL.) 45/2026 & CRL.M.A. 16147/2026 (for stay)

1. By way of this petition under Section 447 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner seeks transfer of two proceedings from the concerned Courts in North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi to any Court outside the Rohini Court complex.
2. The proceedings arise out of FIR No. 219/2025, dated 27.04.2025, under Sections 110/126(2)/324(4)/351(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ["BNS"], registered at Police Station Alipur, Delhi, which is presently pending before the Additional Sessions Judge, Rohini Courts, and FIR No. 83/2026, dated 06.04.2026, under Sections



115(2)/126/356/351 of BNS registered at the Police Station Prashant Vihar, Delhi, which is still pending investigation.

3. This is a peculiar case where the petitioner himself is a serving Inspector in Delhi Police. In FIR No. 219/2025, the petitioner is the Investigating Officer, respondent Nos. 2 to 6 are the accused, respondent No. 7 is their counsel, and respondent No. 8 is the complainant. While in FIR No. 83/2026, the petitioner is the complainant, and respondent No. 7 is the accused.

4. The allegation in the FIR No. 83/2026 pertains to alleged abusive conduct and misbehaviour of respondent No. 7 with the petitioner, when both were attending Court proceedings arising out of FIR No. 219/2025.

5. Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, is present for the State, and Mr. Aditya Kaushik, learned counsel, is also present for respondent No. 7. Respondent No. 7 is also present on video conference.

6. The principal contention of Mr. Prateek Som, learned counsel for the petitioner, is that the petitioner is unable to attend the proceedings in the Rohini Court Complex due to intimidation and abusive behaviour of respondent No. 7, who is the counsel for the accused persons in FIR No. 219/2025, and the accused herself in FIR 83/2026. He has drawn my attention to a transcript of the audio recording of Court proceedings on 06.04.2026 in FIR No. 219/2025, in support of his contention and submits that he had to be escorted by Office Bearer of the Rohini Court Bar Association.

7. Mr. Kaushik disputes these allegation against respondent No. 7 in the petition, but states that respondent No. 7 is willing to give an



undertaking to this Court that she will not contact or interact with the petitioner, either in his capacity as an Investigating Officer and prosecution witness in FIR No. 219/2025 or as a complainant in FIR No. 83/2026.

8. At Mr. Kaushik's request, she is permitted to file an affidavit of undertaking to this effect by tomorrow, i.e. 20.05.2026.

9. In order to ensure that the petitioner is in a position to discharge his duties freely, the Additional Commissioner of Police, Prasant Vihar, is also requested to take necessary steps for his security and protection when he has to attend the Court proceedings in connection with the subject FIRs.

10. The transfer petition is disposed of with these directions.

11. It is made clear that the Court has not commented upon the veracity of the allegations contained in the petition.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 19, 2026

'pv'/AD/