$~100

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010477512026**

\+ W.P.(CRL) 3123/2026

RISHI LEVI .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. K. K. Manan, Senior Advocate with Ms. Uditi Bali, Mr. Luv Manan, Mr. K. S. Chaudhary, Mr. Lavish and Ms. Reenaya Grover, Advocates.

versus

CBI .....Respondent

Through: Ms. Rajni Gupta, SPP with Mr. Shivender Gupta, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

O R D E R

% 02.11.2026

CRL.M.A. 34259/2026 (seeking directions to the Respondent to comply with the directions of this Court in judgment dated 27.1.2026)

1. The present application has been filed by the Petitioner/Applicant, Rishi Levi, seeking (i) directions to the Central Bureau of Investigation to expeditiously comply with the directions contained in paragraph 43 of the judgment dated 27th October, 2026, passed by this Court in W.P.(CRL.) 3132/2026, by communicating the judgment to the concerned authorities in India and the Philippines; and (ii) correction of paragraphs 5 and 50(i) of the said judgment to accurately record that the Applicant joined the investigation in 2006 and left India in 2008, and to clarify that the order

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 04/11/2026 at 11:49:41

passed by the ACMM, East District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, in November 2014, declaring him a Proclaimed Offender, as well as the consequential proclamation/fugitive proceedings initiated against him pursuant to the order dated 12th August, 2014, stand set aside.

2. Insofar as the first relief is concerned, counsel appearing for the CBI submits that the directions contained in paragraph 43 are being complied with and that the requisite steps are underway. In view of the statement made on behalf of the CBI, no further directions are called for in this regard. The CBI shall, however, ensure that the directions issued by this Court are duly complied with.

3. The Petitioner also seeks correction of paragraph 5 of the judgment, contending that he had joined the investigation in 2006 and not 2008. The discrepancy in the year of joining the investigation, however, does not affect the conclusion reached by this Court. The FIR was registered on 20th November, 2006, and the Petitioner claims to have left India on 24th November, 2008. Significantly, the order dated 25th September, 2026, passed by the Special Judge in Bail Application No. 269/26 records that the Petitioner had joined the investigation on one occasion and the same is not disputed. Further, the brief note filed on his behalf acknowledges that he joined the investigation after registration of the FIR. Thus, the fact material to the consideration of the present case, namely, that the Petitioner had joined the investigation after registration of the FIR and before leaving India, remains undisputed. The precise date of his joining the investigation may be considered by the Trial Court at the appropriate stage. No modification of the judgment is, therefore, warranted. Petitioner's contention stands noted.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 04/11/2026 at 11:49:41

4. The Petitioner also seeks modification of paragraph 50(i) of the judgment to incorporate the expression "Fugitive" in addition to the expression "Proclaimed Offender". This request is misconceived. The judgment considered the legality of the declaration made against the Petitioner under Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and set aside the said declaration insofar as it concerned the Petitioner. The expression "Proclaimed Offender" was used with reference to the declaration made by the ACMM under the aforesaid provision. Further, the expression "Fugitive" would introduce a distinct characterisation which was not the subject matter of the adjudication. Moreover, the challenge to the RCN and the consequential extradition proceedings was expressly rejected. The Court, therefore, finds no reason to modify the operative direction in the manner sought.

5. In view of the foregoing, no ground for modification or further directions is made out. The application is accordingly dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 2, 2026

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 04/11/2026 at 11:49:41