



\$~121

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 8025/2025, CRL.M.A. 1018/2026 & CRL.M.A.
12411/2026
EX GC INDERJEETPetitioner

Through: Ms. Kavita Jha, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ankit Singh, Mr. Roshan
Kumar, Advocates.

versus

THE DIRECTOR CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
ANR.Respondent

Through: Mr. Atul Guleria, SPP with Mr.
Aryan Rakesh, Advocate for CBI.
Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC with Ms.
Ayushi Sriastava, Mr. Arpan
Narwal, Mr. Kushagra Malik, Mr.
Ujjwal Tyagi, Advocates for UOI.
Major Anish Murlidhar.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

% **ORDER**
19.05.2026

CRL.M.A. 16091/2026 (for early hearing)

This is an application for early hearing of the captioned petition,
which is next scheduled to be listed on 31.08.2026.

For the reasons stated therein, and with the consent of learned
counsel for the respondents, the application is allowed. The petition is
taken up for hearing.

The application stands disposed of.



CRL.M.C. 8025/2025

1. By way of this petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner who was undergoing training at the Indian Military Academy, Dehradun, seeks quashing of FIR bearing No. RC-DAI-2021-A-0013 dated 13.03.2021, registered against him by the Central Bureau of Investigation [“CBI”], Anti-Corruption Branch, New Delhi, under Section 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Section 7/7A/8/12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
2. The FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint dated 13.03.2021, by the Additional Directorate General, Discipline and Vigilance, Adjutant General’s Branch, Integrated Head Quarters of Ministry of Defence (Army), Delhi Head Quarters. The complaint concerns allegations of irregularities in the recruitment process, and according to the complainant, show culpability of civilians and service personnels in clearing the Service Selection Board. The petitioner was one of the named accused in the complaint and the FIR.
3. Ms. Kavita Jha, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, points out that a status report dated 07.02.2026 has been filed by the CBI, in which it is stated as follows:

“3. That it is further submitted that the investigation stands concluded. Accordingly, CBI report elaborating findings of investigation was sent to Ministry of Defence for sanction of prosecution u/s 19 of PC Act against the accused persons. The sanction for prosecution against all the accused public servants has now been received and the charge-sheet would be submitted soon before Ld. Trial Court.

4. The investigation has not yielded any direct or circumstantial evidence establishing any offence against the present petitioner.

5. The present petition is therefore an attempt to bypass the statutory criminal process and to bypass judicial determination by the competent criminal court. Such a course is impermissible in law,



particularly when it has already been submitted by CBI that investigation has not substantiated any allegations against present petitioner.”

4. Mr. Atul Guleria, learned Special Public Prosecutor for the CBI, states that the chargesheet has not yet been filed, but will be filed within one week. He reiterates, upon instructions from the Investigating Officer who is present in Court, that the CBI does not propose to name the petitioner as an accused in the chargesheet.

5. The matter, however, does not rest here in view of the submissions of Mr. Amit Tiwari, learned Central Government Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant – Union of India [“UoI”], that, having perused the draft chargesheet annexed to the petition, the UoI proposes to file a protest petition, and seek framing of charges against the present petitioner. It is the case of the UoI that the material on record, including the material discovered by the Military Intelligence and forwarded to the CBI, shows the involvement of the petitioner to the required threshold for the framing of charges.

6. Having regard to this position, I am of the view that, it will be premature at this stage to quash the FIR against the petitioner. Even though, the CBI as the prosecuting agency may have made a determination with regard to the lack of evidence against the petitioner, the Special Court is required to take the final decision with regard to the framing of charges against various individuals. For this purpose, it is not in dispute that the UoI as the complainant would also have the right to file a protest petition.

7. However, Ms. Jha has rightly submitted that the pendency of the



proceedings has a grave effect on the petitioner's career. She, therefore, submits that time bound directions be given for completion of the proceedings before the Special Court. Mr. Guleria reiterates that the chargesheet will be filed within a period of one week from today, and Mr. Tiwari also submits that the UoI will take necessary steps within the time prescribed in law, and no unnecessary adjournments will be sought either on behalf of the UoI or the prosecution before the Special Court.

8. The petition, alongwith pending applications, is disposed of in terms of the above submissions.

9. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observations with regard to the merits of the proceedings before the Special Court.

10. The date already fixed, i.e. 31.08.2026, stands cancelled.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 19, 2026

tg/KA/