

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 20114 of 2025)

AKSHAY KANTILAL BAM & ANR.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ANR.

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

1) Leave granted.

2) The present appeal is preferred assailing order dated 31.10.2025 passed by the High Court dismissing the Criminal Revision 1483 of 2025 of the appellants, confirming the order dated 07.03.2025 in S.T. No. 315/2024 passed by 22nd ASJ, Indore, framing charge under Section 307 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC), in addition to the other offences.

3) It is not in dispute that one of the co-accused Satbir has already died and the proceedings against him stood abated.

4) As per prosecution case, the complainant

(Respondent No. 2 - Yunus Patel) lodged FIR No. 581/2007 dated 04.10.2007 at 6.10 p.m. (1810 hours) at Police Station Khajrana, District Indore. It was alleged that, at around 10.30 a.m., when his workers Kailash, Gopal and Jitendra were harvesting soyabean on the field, the Appellants-Kantilal Bam and Akshay Kantilal along with 7-8 persons reached on the spot and claimed ownership of the land. They questioned the workers as to why they were harvesting soyabean on the land, assaulted them with sticks and set ablaze the harvested soyabean. Haji Fakru Patel, uncle of the complainant informed him about this incident. On receiving the call, the complainant went to the field and found his workers having stick injuries and terrified. He then visited the police station to lodge FIR. In the meanwhile, complainant's uncle again informed him that the Appellants along with Satveer, Manoj (Security Guard), Sonu and 7-8 persons armed with guns had again come on field to take possession. On seeing complainant, Appellant-Kantilal Bam exhorted in loud voice - "This is Yunus Guddu, shoot him and kill him". At that time,

companion Rinku pulled the complainant back and shouted to save themselves. In the meantime, complainant's uncle Fakru and other people working on the field and surrounding area reached on spot and saved the complainant. Consequently, for the alleged incident, FIR was lodged under Sections 323, 294, 336, 147, 148 and 149 IPC.

5) It is not out of place to mention that, qua the same incident, Satveer Singh also lodged FIR No. 580/2007 registered at 6.05 p.m. (1805 hours) on same date 04.10.2007 at same police station Khajrana, alleging that, one Rajesh Jain, partner of the Yunus Patel, met him at about 12 in the noon. Around that time, he received a call from T.I. Palasia, informing that guards have been placed on his field and some quarrel is going on the land. When Satveer reached the Kanadia Bypass Square, two police constables were standing and he was made him to accompany them. He was taken to the field where the incident allegedly occurred. After a while, they kept him between the hooligans and Yunus Patel alongwith his companions and three police personnels started beating him

hurling abuses in the name of sister. At that time, his two guards Manoj and Sonu and one gunman Radhkishan also arrived, however, after having snatched the gun, Yunus Patel and his companions also beat them with bucket and hockey sticks. The mobile number referred in the FIR is of Surjeet Singh and Rs. 90,000/- had been snatched along with his purse containing two Credit Cards, PAN card, driving license and two Debit Cards of two Banks. It is further alleged that Yonus Patel pressurized Satveer Singh to touch his feet and pressurized him to apologize. He threatened Satveer if he is seen in that area again, he will shoot him with a gun. Hence, the FIR for offences under Sections 395, 323, 294 and 506 IPC of the said incident was also lodged.

6) In view of the above, it is clear that, narrating divergent stories, two reports were registered on the same date, i.e., 04.10.2007, which appear to be cross FIRs in nature. It is to be noted that in FIR No. 581, wherein the appellants are made accused, is subsequent, in which the statement of Yunus Patel got recorded on next date i.e., 05.10.2007. In the FIR or

his statement, he has not stated that gun fire was shot on the field, however, in FIR No. 581/2007, seizure of gun has been alleged and recovered *vide* seizure memo dated 04.10.2007. Another statement of Yunus Patel has been recorded after 12 days i.e., 16.10.2007, in which, fire by using gun has been alleged. Thereafter, statement of one Usman Patel was recorded on 19.10.2007, who had reached on spot later, but narrated the similar story as alleged. The chargesheet was filed on 06.09.2014, after about 7 years for the offences under Sections 323, 294, 506, 147, 148 and 435 IPC only and not under Section 307 read with Section 149 and 120-B of IPC.

7) At the same time, in the cross FIR which was prior in time, i.e., FIR No. 580/2007, the chargesheet was also filed at the same time for the offences under Sections 323, 294, 506, 147, 148 and 149 of IPC.

8) After approximately 10 years of filing of chargesheet, an application was filed by the complainant on 05.04.2024 before the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, *inter alia*, contending that

in the facts and statement as recorded, the charges under Sections 307 read with Section 149 and 120-B of IPC be also framed along with other offences. Opposing the application, the reply was filed on 18.04.2025, refuting the allegations and contending that such recourse to add the offence after 17 years is not justified. The application has been moved with an intention to harass the Appellant and is liable to be dismissed at the outset.

9) Learned Judicial Magistrate *vide* order dated 24.04.2024 allowed the application and committed the case to the Court of Sessions, since the offence under Section 307 IPC was triable by the Court of Sessions. The committal order was assailed by the Appellants in revision, which came to be dismissed on 01.08.2024. Thereafter, on filing quash petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., it was withdrawn since charges were framed on 07.03.2025 for the offences under 447, 148, 323, alternatively 323/149 (three counts), 307/149, 435 and 506 of IPC. Challenging the said order, Appellants filed revision, which has been dismissed *vide* order impugned, hence, this appeal.

10) Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned senior counsel for the Appellants, has strenuously urged that in the facts and allegations, the alleged incident occurred in two parts. In the first part, as alleged, assault took place by means of stick and in the second part, the accused persons allegedly reached on field, and on instigation of Appellant No. 2, co-accused Satveer fired a gun shot. At that time, one Rinku was on spot and had pulled back the complainant. In the first statement of the complainant, dated 05.10.2007, no gunshot fire was alleged, which only surfaced in subsequent statement taken after 12 days of the incident. It is contended that allegations are afterthought; the chargesheet has been filed after seven years without any offence under Section 307; the application has been filed after around 17 years from incident to add Section 307 of IPC on the anvil of gunshot by the co-accused, though no gunshot injury was caused to complainant.

11) It is further submitted that, FIR No. 580/2007 was lodged on behalf of the Appellants by Satveer prior in time, wherein categoric allegations qua

snatching of gun by the accused persons therein has been alleged. However, surprisingly, the seizure of gun has been indicated in FIR No. 581/2007. Merely on account of seizure of gun, the Appellants cannot be made accused of charges under Section 307 of IPC. Even otherwise, on parallel reading of both the FIRs, it does not inspire confidence since both the parties were present at the same time in the police station, then how second part of the alleged incident can happen.

12) It is urged by Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned senior counsel that, the charge under Sections 307 and 149 of IPC is mechanically framed in addition to the other offences, which were triable by the Magistrate.

13) Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned senior counsel has also contended that, Section 319 of CrPC deals with the power of the Court to proceed against the persons appearing to be guilty of offence. However, such can be in the course of 'inquiry into' or 'trial of' an offence based on the evidence. The stage of inquiry as provided in Section 319 CrPC commences from the

stage of filing of charge-sheet and on consideration of material collected by prosecution in the charge-sheet. The inquiry as contemplated has to be understood in the in terms of Section 2(g) of CrPC which means every inquiry other than a trial, conducted under CrPC by a Magistrate or Court. In view of the above, it is urged that the order passed by the Trial Court requires interference. In support of his contentions, learned senior counsel placed reliance on the judgment of *Hardeep Singh v. State of Punjab and Others*¹, *B.N. John v. State of U.P. and Another*² and *State of Gujarat v. Girish Radhakrishnan Varde*³.

14) *Per contra*, Ms. Manisha T. Karia, learned senior counsel representing the State of Madhya Pradesh, submits that it is a case in which the incident cannot be doubted, since on the date cross FIRs were registered. It is her contention that initially in FIR, the allegation qua Section 307 IPC may not be alleged, but such allegation came in subsequent

1 (2014) 3 SCC 92

2 2025 SCC OnLine SC 7

3 (2014) 3 SCC 659

statement under Section 161 CrPC of the complainant, on 16.10.2007. It is urged that, use of gun was not necessary to cause injury for the offences under Section 307 IPC as alleged. The allegations made later were sufficient for the Magistrate to pass the order of committal, and the Sessions Court rightly framed the charge under Sections 307/149 IPC along with other offences. She further submitted that the High Court has rightly confirmed the order of framing of charge and refused to interfere and discharge the Appellants.

15) Mr. Divyakant Lahoti, learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 - complainant, relying upon the documents, vociferously made an attempt to satisfy that, though the allegations in the FIR were of other offences, but after seizure of the gun on 04.10.2007 itself and crime detail form on 05.10.2007, it is apparent that on account of quarrel, a gun shot was fired and same was corroborated by subsequent statement of the complainant. It is urged that, variation in statement, if any, is not required to be looked into at the stage of framing the charge and

the same is subject matter of trial. It is also contended that the order of committal by learned Magistrate was passed in exercise of power under Section 209 CrPC read with Section 207 and 208 CrPC, and in consideration of the protest petition filed by the complainant.

16) The said order of committal was assailed before the Court of Sessions in revision which was dismissed. While filing petition under Section 482 CrPC, the Appellant has not disclosed about filing of revision before Sessions Court. Thereafter, charges have rightly been framed under Sections 307/149 of IPC. It is contended that challenge to the order framing charge confined to Sections 307/149 of IPC only, in absence of challenge to the charges under other offences is not justified. He further submitted that the High Court while confirming the order has categorically noted that the cause of injury is not decisive to determine the act of accused or to negate the charge of Section 307 of IPC. The seizure of 0.12 bore gun with used cartridge from the place of incident as alleged has been made, which was

allegedly used for gunshot fire on said date. The record testifies 'grave suspicion' which is enough for framing of charge of Section 307. Further, since the application was made during the pendency of trial, the delay of 17 years cannot be a ground to reject it at the threshold. Therefore, it was urged that the matter has been appreciated in the right perspective by the Courts below and requires no interference. In support, reliance is placed on the judgment on *Sajjan Kumar v. Central Bureau of Investigation*⁴.

17) Heard learned counsel of both sides, perused the allegations and counter allegations in the FIR and counter FIR. As is borne from the records, indeed some incident occurred. The first FIR No. 580/2007 was lodged by Satveer Singh on 04.10.2007 at 6.05 p.m. (1805 hours) at Police Station, Khajrana, for the offences under Sections 395, 323, 294 and 506 IPC. In the said FIR, Satveer Singh alleged that his gun was snatched by Yunus Patel and other accompanying persons. He was saved by his guards and

⁴ (2010) 9 SCC 368

other persons present there. The second FIR No. 581/2007 was lodged by the complainant in the present case at the same police station with regard to the incident dated 04.10.2007 at 06.10 p.m. (1810 hours). The narration in the said FIR is indicative of the fact that since morning at 10.30 a.m., the incident occurred in two spells.

18) In the first spell, the Appellants along with 7-8 persons reached on field where the workers of Yunus Patel were harvesting soyabeans. The said harvest of soyabeans was set ablaze and the workers were assaulted by sticks. In the subsequent narration, it is stated that the Appellants along with Satveer Singh armed with gun reached the spot coupled with 7-8 other persons. As alleged, Appellant No. 2 instigated Satveer to shoot him and at that moment, Rinku who was with Yunus Patel pulled him back when the bullet passed by him. Thereafter, both of them started running from there to save themselves, and meanwhile other people working on the field gathered there.

19) On perusal of the first statement of Yunus Patel

taken on 05.10.2007, it reveals, in second spell of incident, the allegation was that when the Appellants came back again to take possession on the land along with 7-8 persons armed with guns, and on exhortation of Appellant No. 2 that "This is Yunus Guddu, shoot him and kill him.", Rinku pulled back the complainant under the apprehension that he might be shot. As such, in the FIR or in the first statement allegation of gunshot fire is not there. In the subsequent statement dated 16.10.2007, the complainant made improvisation and stated that on exhortation of Appellant No.2, Satveer fired a shot, upon which, Rinku caught hold of his hand and pulled him back.

20) We have also gone through the seizure memo dated 04.10.2007 referred to, wherein the seizure of the gun in FIR No. 581/2007 is shown at 4.40 p.m. (1640 hours). It is pertinent that once FIR was registered at 6.10 p.m. (1810 hours) and as per due procedure, crime number can be given thereafter only, then how recovery prior to registration of FIR can be possible. No explanation has been put forth in this regard by the State or the complainant. Similarly,

the crime detail form as referred regarding FIR No. 581/2007 dated 05.10.2007 merely indicate that there was some incident at the tubewell on water, where the persons allegedly had quarreled and fired a gun. The basis of preparation of the said crime detail form may be the FIR or the statement dated 05.10.2007 of Yunus Patel. But no allegation of use of gun and fire by gunshot matching second spell of incident has been alleged by that time. Therefore, reliance on the crime detail form is also of no substance.

21) In this view of the matter, we are unable to accept the contentions as advanced before us by learned counsel for the complainant that the gun was used in commission of the offence and the fire was shot by the said gun which was seized. In our view, such argument is completely fallacious looking to the allegation of FIR No. 580/2007 lodged by accused side, wherein it is clearly said that the gun of the co-accused Satveer was snatched by the complainant side, prior to the registration of FIR No. 581/ 2007 by Yunus Patel.

22) At this juncture, it is imperative to understand

the interplay between Section 319 CrPC and Section 209 CrPC. To understand the limitations on the Magistrate's jurisdiction on committal proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 319 of CrPC, we can profitably refer to the Constitution Bench judgment of this Court in **Hardeep Singh** (supra), wherein this Court observed as thus:

"27. The stage of inquiry commences, insofar as the court is concerned, with the filing of the charge-sheet and the consideration of the material collection by the prosecution that is mentioned in the charge-sheet for the purpose of trying the accused. This has to be understood in terms of Section 2(g) CrPC, which defines an inquiry as follows:

"2. (g) 'inquiry' means every inquiry, other than a trial, conducted under this Code by a Magistrate or Court.'

... ..

47. Since after the filing of the charge-sheet, the court reaches the stage of inquiry and as soon as the court frames the charges, the trial commences, and therefore, the power under Section 319(1) CrPC can be exercised at any time after the charge-sheet is filed and before the pronouncement of judgment, except during the stage of Sections 207/208 CrPC, committal, etc. which is only a pre-trial stage, intended to put the process into motion. This stage cannot be said to be a judicial step in the true sense for it only requires an application of mind rather than a judicial application of mind. At this pre-trial stage, the Magistrate is required to perform acts in the nature of administrative work rather than judicial such as ensuring compliance with Sections 207 and 208 CrPC, and committing the matter if it is exclusively triable by the Sessions Court. Therefore, it would be legitimate for us to conclude that the Magistrate at

the stage of Sections 207 to 209 CrPC is forbidden, by express provision of Section 319 CrPC, to apply his mind to the merits of the case and determine as to whether any accused needs to be added or subtracted to face trial before the Court of Session."

From the above, it is clear that at the stage of committal of proceedings, the Magistrate exercises purely administrative function and lacks the judicial authority to look into the merits of the case.

23) In the case of **Girish Radhakrishnan Varde** (supra), pursuant to the FIR, the police submitted a charge-sheet that omitted Sections 364, 394, and 398 of the IPC. At the complainant's behest, the Magistrate allowed an application to incorporate these additional offences. However, the Sessions Court set aside the Magistrate's order, which was affirmed by the High Court. In appeal, this Court while addressing the issue as to whether a Magistrate can add omitted offenses while taking cognizance, or if altering charges is exclusively the within trial Court's domain under Sections 216, 218, or 228 of the CrPC, observed as thus:

"15. The question, therefore, emerges as to whether the complainant/ informant/prosecution would be precluded from seeking a remedy if the investigating

authorities have failed in their duty by not including all the sections of IPC on which offence can be held to have been made out in spite of the facts disclosed in the FIR. The answer obviously has to be in the negative as the prosecution cannot be allowed to suffer prejudice by ignoring exclusion of the sections which constitute the offence if the investigating authorities for any reason whatsoever have failed to include all the offences into the charge-sheet based on the FIR on which investigation had been conducted. But then a further question arises as to whether this lacunae can be allowed to be filled in by the Magistrate before whom the matter comes up for taking cognizance after submission of the charge-sheet and as already stated, the Magistrate in a case which is based on a police report cannot add or subtract sections at the time of taking cognizance as the same would be permissible by the trial court only at the time of framing of charge under Sections 216, 218 or under Section 228 CrPC as the case may be which means that after submission of the charge-sheet it will be open for the prosecution to contend before the appropriate trial court at the stage of framing of charge to establish that on the given state of facts the appropriate sections which according to the prosecution should be framed can be allowed to be framed. Simultaneously, the accused also has the liberty at this stage to submit whether the charge under a particular provision should be framed or not and this is the appropriate forum in a case based on police report to determine whether the charge can be framed and a particular section can be added or removed depending upon the material collected during investigation as also the facts disclosed in the FIR and the charge-sheet."

24) Lately, on the issue of factual defects in the initial complaint and FIR, this Court in **B.N. John** (supra), wherein the appellant following a raid on his children's hostel was charged with Section 353 of

IPC for alleged obstruction using criminal force against public servants. However, later in the charge-sheet Section 186 of the IPC was added, prompting the Chief Judicial Magistrate to take cognizance. Appellant laid challenge to the legality of the entire proceeding on the ground that mandatory written complaint was never filed with a Judicial Magistrate and that the initial FIR completely lacked the necessary allegations of assault or criminal force required to sustain the charges. This Court in appeal observed as thus:

“27. The High Court, however, has held that on a perusal of the contents of the FIR and the statement made by the witnesses recorded under Section 161 of the CrPC, it can be said that a prima facie case has been made out against the appellant for commission of offences under Section 353 and Section 186 of the IPC. It is to be noted that the FIR was filed under Section 353 of the IPC without mentioning Section 186 of the IPC.

*What is to be noted in the present case is that if the appellant had actually used criminal force or had assaulted the public servants, which would bring the said acts within the scope of Section 353 of the IPC, **nothing prevented the complainant from mentioning the same in the FIR being the first information. If such vital and crucial facts are missing from the FIR of which the complainant was fully aware of and was already cognizant of, which he could have mentioned at the first instance, it would indicate that any subsequent mentioning of these facts in the case by the complainant would be an afterthought as has***

happened in the present case. The alleged fact of assault, or use of criminal force by the appellant could not be said to have been discovered at a later point of time, as these offensive acts, if really had happened, would have happened before the filing of the FIR/complaint and thus should have found mention in the FIR. These acts were not something that had happened at a later point of time, but would have been known to the complainant had these happened when the complainant and official party were raiding the hostel managed by the appellant. Thus, the absence of mentioning these alleged acts which would constitute ingredients of the offence under Section 353 of the IPC, renders the FIR legally untenable as far as the offence under Section 353 of the IPC is concerned. We do not see any reason why the complainant failed to mention in the FIR the alleged use of criminal force or assault of the public servants to prevent them from discharging their official duties when they were raiding the premises."

25) Viewed from this perspective, the facts of the present case raise a similar question. In the instant case also, nothing prevented the complainant from reporting the act of gunshot by Satveer in his first statement dated 05.10.2007. It is not the case wherein the complainant is a hearsay witness in the case. On the contrary, he is a first-hand victim and was present on the spot. Adding a categorical allegation in the subsequent statement does not inspire confidence and as already discussed above, in absence of gun-shot injury to the complainant coupled with seizure of gun prior to lodging of FIR. All

these factors ought to have been taken into consideration prior to adding the charge of Section 307 IPC against the Appellants after 17 years of lodging of FIR.

26) In view of the above discussion, the only inescapable conclusion comes to our view is that some incident had taken place wherein some altercations took place and the assault by sticks have been alleged against the appellants and other persons but do not narrate the use of firearms in the first instance. In the second instance also, which is allegedly said to have occurred between 10.30 a.m. to 4.15 p.m., it is contended that Appellant No. 2 instigated Satveer for use of firearm, but such bears no mention in the first statement. Such narration has only been made in the subsequent statement which has been given after 12 days. In our view, the said variation is material in the facts of the case, which was duly considered by the investigating authority to omit Section 307 of IPC from the charge-sheet. Nonetheless, this aspect ought to have been considered by the Trial Court at the time of framing

of the charge under Section 307/149 IPC.

27) It is to observe that the incident took place in 2007 qua which the chargesheet was filed in 2014. This has a material bearing. Another fact which bears material bearing is that, in the chargesheet filed in 2014, the police had not reported the offence of Section 307/149 IPC. The learned Magistrate while passing order dated 24.04.2024 committed the case to the Court of Sessions and referred to some observations without taking note of facts as discussed hereinabove, merely on an application preferred by complainant after 17 years, by forming simpliciter opinion that this is a case under Sections 307/149 IPC also.

28) In view of the discussion made hereinabove, the material contained in the FIR and the first statement of Yunus Patel do not contemplate anything about use of firearm and fire shot at that time. It has rightly been pointed out by Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned senior counsel for the Appellants, that the statement of Rinku who is allegedly the companion of Yunus Patel, has not been recorded by the police in the

entire case. It may be relevant evidence for the allegations in the FIR as well as in the first statement and the second statement of the complainant. The said argument bears weight and deserves to be accepted.

29) In the situation as discussed hereinabove, we are satisfied that the order of committal by the Magistrate in exercise of power under Section 209 CrPC following Sections 207 and 208 CrPC is not justified.

30) Since the material does not warrant taking of cognizance under Section 307 IPC and framing of charges under Section 307 IPC, therefore, the order passed by the Trial Court is without application of mind. Ordering of committal merely on an application by the complainant to frame the charge under Sections 307/149 IPC is without due appreciation of the material. The High Court without ascertaining the relevant factors has confirmed the order of framing of charge under Sections 307/149 IPC. Therefore, in our view, the accused persons have rightly assailed the order of framing of charge only with respect to

Sections 307/149 IPC before the High Court. Accordingly, the order of framing of charge under Sections 307/149 IPC and confirmation of such charge by the High Court is wholly unjustified, consequently set aside.

31) Accordingly, the present criminal appeal is hereby allowed, and the above orders are quashed and set-aside. The Sessions Court shall remit the matter to the jurisdictional Magistrate who may look into the evidence, allegations and frame the charge afresh and proceed in accordance with law.

32) Since the present case has been dealt looking to the material in detail on facts, therefore, the judgments as relied upon are of not much relevance and accordingly, we are not dealing with these judgments in detail.

33) We are conscious of the fact that the discussion as made hereinabove is only to the extent of issue of framing of charge under Sections 307/149 IPC; it has nothing to do with the merits of the case. However, after remitting the matter to the concerned

jurisdictional Magistrate, he shall try the offence uninfluenced by any of the observations made hereinabove.

34) Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

....., J.
[J.K. MAHESHWARI]

....., J.
[ATUL S. CHANDURKAR]

New Delhi;
April 27, 2026.

ITEM NO.33

COURT NO.3

SECTION II-E

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (CrL.) No. 20114/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 31-10-2025 in CRR No. 1483/2025 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Indore]

AKSHAY KANTILAL BAM & ANR.
Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ANR.
Respondent(s)

Date : 27-04-2026 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.K. MAHESHWARI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ATUL S. CHANDURKAR

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Siddharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Mir, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Abhinav Malhotra, Adv.
Mr. Mayank Kshirsagar, AOR
Ms. Pavani Verma, Adv.
Mr. Yash Dutt, Adv.
Mr. Kartikeya Dang, Adv.
Mr. Lokesh Malik, Adv.
Ms. Atika Chaturvedi, Adv.
Mr. Chandrashekhar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

Mr. Divyakant Lahoti, Adv.
Ms. Praveena Bisht, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Tripathi, Adv.
Mr. Aviral Parashar, Adv.
Ms. Mahima Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Niraj Sharma, AOR

Ms. Manisha T. Karia, Sr. A.A.G.
Mr. Sarthak Raizada, Adv.
Mr. Shantanu Krishna, Adv.
Mr. Pashupathi Nath Razdan, AOR

Mr. Mirza Kayesh Begg, Adv.
Ms. Maitreyee Jagat Joshi, Adv.
Mr. Shadab Anwar, Adv.
Mr. Zartab Anwar, Adv.
Mr. Astik Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Akanksha Tomar, Adv.
Mr. Shravan Bagora, Adv.

**UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R**

- 1) Leave granted.
- 2) The present criminal appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

**(NIDHI AHUJA)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

**(NAND KISHOR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

[Signed order is placed on the file.]