



2025:DHC:2176



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

% **Pronounced on: 28th March, 2025**

+ CRL.M.C. 5141/2023 & CRL. M.A. 19522/2023

VED PRAKASH AGGARWALPetitioner

Through: Mr. Yugant Sharma, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ...Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj, SPP
with Mr.Kushagra Kumar and Mr.
Abhinav Bhardwaj and Mr. Vishal
Baliyan, Advocates for CBI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA DHARI SINGH

J U D G M E N T

CHANDRA DHARI SINGH, J.

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter "CrPC") [now Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter "BNSS")] has been filed on behalf of the petitioner against the order dated 9th March, 2023 passed by the learned Special Judge, Rouse Avenue District Court, Delhi in CC NO. 161/2019.

2. The petitioner had filed an application under Section 207 of the CrPC before the learned Special Judge, seeking the supply of two crucial documents relied upon by the CBI in the charge sheet, i.e., an email dated



2025:DHC:2176



25th June, 2014 sent by Mr. Pankaj Bansal of M/s Altius Finserve Pvt. Ltd., and the data of the voice spectrographic analysis labeled as “D-48.”

3. The learned Special Judge directed the Director of Central Forensic Science Laboratory, CBI, to appoint a qualified expert to demonstrate the process of voice sample examination in court, however later, *vide* the impugned order dated 9th May, 2023, while the request for supply of the email was accepted, the request for supplying the voice spectrographic analysis data was rejected. Aggreived by the said order, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of the present petition.

4. In light of the judgment of the even date passed in CRL.M.C. 2526/2019, by virtue of which RC No. – AC-1/2014/A-0005/CBI/AC-I dated 1st August, 2014 as well as the final report dated 27th September, 2017 filed in CC No. 30/2017, and all the other consequential proceedings arising out of the said FIR have been quashed *qua* the petitioner namely Mr. Ved Prakash Agarwal, nothing survives for further adjudication in the instant petition as the same is now rendered infructuous.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed as rendered infructuous along with the pending applications, if any.

6. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

(CHANDRA DHARI SINGH)
JUDGE

MARCH 28, 2025
rt/ryp/kj