



\$~16

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4461/2026 & CRL.M.A. 18337/2026**

RANVEER SINGH CHANDELA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kanika Bhardwaj, Mr. Aditya Sharda and Ms. Nargis, Advs.

versus

STATE OF DELHI NCT AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP.
SI Kamal Chaudhary, PS:
Kishangarh.
Mr. Himanshu Mahajan, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

01.07.2026

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the husband of respondent no.2 approached the petitioner for the construction of a Mid-luxury house in Gurugram, Haryana. An agreement was signed against a total consideration of Rs.2,32,50,000/- on account of default, and delays occurred on the part of the respondents, the petitioner was informed by the husband of respondent no.2 to close the work amicably. The petitioner agreed and signed the settlement *vide* letter dated 06.09.2024 and issued two post-dated cheques of Rs. 35,98,609/- each. According to the petitioner, the respondents demanded an additional amount and had threatened to implicate the petitioner. The petitioner thus submitted that the respondents made



efforts to get the criminal case registered against the petitioner at Gurugram and Faridabad police stations, however, both police stations did not register any criminal case, finding the dispute to be civil in nature.

2. It is, thus, submitted that, thereafter, at the instance of the respondents, an FIR was registered against the petitioner. The petitioner is fully cooperating and has submitted all the documents. Despite that, the Investigating Officer is harassing the petitioners and is not closing the FIR.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the original complainant submits that the cheques which were furnished by the petitioner got dishonoured on account of directions to stop payments. It, however, remains undisputed that the cases under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 are pending before the Court of competent jurisdiction. The petitioner undertakes to cooperate in those cases.

4. The petitioner when earlier approached this Court for quashment of the FIR, the Court *vide* order dated 01.12.2025, granted liberty to the petitioner to take appropriate remedies after the conclusion of the investigation.

5. It is stated by Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, learned APP and Mr. Himanshu Mahajan, Advocate, who appears for the prosecution and the complainant, respectively, that the investigation has not yet been completed, therefore, the application is immature.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of this case, the Court finds that the investigation of this nature has to be taken to its logical conclusion with due expedition.

7. Mr. Singh, on instructions, submits that the investigating officer be granted two months' time to complete the investigation.



8. In view of the aforesaid, at this stage, no final view is expressed by the Court and it is directed that the investigation be completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order passed today.
9. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the outcome of the investigation, he is granted the same liberty which was granted *vide* order dated 01.12.2025.
10. With these observations, petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

JULY 01, 2026/P