



\$~34

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

% **Date of Decision: 06th February, 2026**

+ **CRL.M.C. 564/2026 & CRL.M.A. 2281/2026**

DAYA NAND

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for the
State with SI Bheru Sahai, DIU/Outer
Distt.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

JUDGMENT (oral)

1. The petitioner appears in person and challenges order dated 20.11.2025 passed by learned Revisional Court.
2. It seems that his main grievance is to the effect that, one Meena Devi should have also been charge-sheeted which is based on his report i.e. FIR 7/2022, registered at P.S. Mundka.
3. However, the order of learned Revisional Court does not seem to be adverse to the petitioner, as the learned Revisional Court, while deciding Crl.Rev.P.143/2025 in its order dated 20.11.2025, has observed as under:-

“7. Trial Court Record shows that in case FIR No.07/2022, PS Mundka, Charge-sheet has been presented and the matter is listed for arguments on charge.

7.1 Considering that no order on charge has yet been made by Ld. Trial Court and considering the fact that the petitioner herein wants to place his submissions on record at the time of arguments on charge, he is accorded one more opportunity to make all his submissions before the Trial Court. The petitioner is directed that all his submissions must be



in writing. It is made clear that the petitioner shall have only one opportunity to do so as the Ld. Trial Court had already accorded him enough opportunity to do so. The next date of hearing before the Ld. Trial Court is 22. 11.2025. Since 22.11.2025 is nearby, the Ld. Trial Court is directed to accord the petitioner herein an opportunity to present his written arguments on any date after 22.11.2025.

8. The revision petition is accordingly disposed off.”

4. The petitioner was earlier aggrieved by order dated 19.02.2025 passed by the concerned Magisterial Court, whereby his right to file written arguments on the aspect of charge was closed.
5. The abovesaid order passed by learned Revisional Court would, clearly, indicate that he has been given a specific right in this regard and can always place on record his written submissions before the concerned Magisterial Court.
6. In view of the above, after some arguments, the petitioner does not press the present petition. He, however, submits that he may be given liberty to challenge the order on charge, if the charges are not ascertained in consonance with the averments and allegations appearing in the charge-sheet.
7. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms. Liberty, as prayed, is always with the petitioner.
8. All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.
9. Pending application also stands disposed of.
10. Copy of the order be given *dasti* under signatures of Court Master.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 6, 2026/st/sa