



§~9

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

*Date of Decision: 12<sup>th</sup> January, 2026**Uploaded on: 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2026*

+

**CRL.A. 251/2025**

PARVEEN TANEJA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Hitain Bajaj, Adv. for Mr.  
Sudarshan Rajan, Adv. (DHLSC)

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri, APP with  
Ms. Divya Yadav & Mr. Lalit Luthra,  
Advs. along with Insp. Amit Kumar,  
PS Badarpur**CORAM:****JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH****JUSTICE MADHU JAIN****Prathiba M. Singh, J. (Oral)**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

**CRL.M.(BAIL) 451/2025 (For Suspension of Sentence) in CRL.A.  
251/2025**2. On the previous date of hearing *i.e.*, 8th October, 2025 the Court was considering the present application and had directed as under:

*“2. In view of the directions passed by the Supreme Court in the case of “Kaushal Singh vs. The State of Rajasthan” 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1473, decided on 18.07.2025, the learned counsel for the appellant seeks time to place an affidavit on record, thereby stating about the past involvement of the appellant in criminal case(s), if any, registered against him, containing all the particulars of the said case(s).*

*3. Let the affidavit be placed on record, within a period of two weeks, with advance copy to the opposite side.*



4. List on 12.11.2025”

3. Thereafter, on 12th November, 2025, the Court had granted further time to the Appellant to place on record the affidavit regarding the criminal antecedents of the Appellant in the following terms:

*“1. Pursuant to the Order dated 08.10.2025, affidavit regarding criminal history of the appellant is still awaited.*

*2. Let affidavit regarding criminal history of the appellant be filed and placed on record, before the next date of hearing, with advance copy to the opposite side.*

*3. List on 12.01.2026.”*

4. Today, Id. Counsel for the Appellant submits that he has sought the details of the past involvements of the Appellant, who is still in judicial custody and he is yet to receive the same. He seeks further time to file the aforesaid affidavit.

5. The Court notices that in a large number of applications seeking suspension of sentence, adjournments are repeatedly being sought both by the Appellants concerned as also the State in order to bring on record the data relating to criminal antecedents of the Appellant.

6. In the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in ***Criminal Appeal No. 632/2022*** titled ***‘Jagjeet Singh & Ors. v. Ashish Mishra @ Monu & Anr.,’*** the following directions were issued:

*“44. Needless to say that the bail application shall be decided on merits and after giving adequate opportunity of hearing to the victims as well. If the victims are unable to engage the services of a private counsel, it shall be obligatory upon the High Court to*



*provide them a legal aid counsel with adequate experience in criminal law, at the State's expense."*

7. In terms of this judgment, adequate opportunity of hearing is to be granted to the victims and intimation is to be issued by the IO/SHO to the kith and kin of the deceased, who can join the proceedings when the bail applications are being heard.

8. Additionally, in '***Kaushal Singh v. The State of Rajasthan***' 2025 SCC ***OnLine SC 1473***, the Supreme Court has given the following directions:

*"22. Before parting, we would like to state that, accounting for the criminal antecedents of the accused while considering the bail applications has been the subject matter of concern for Courts across the country. The rules and orders of the Punjab and Haryana High Court, to be specific, Rule 5 of Chapter 1-A(b) Volume-V specifically provide as below:*

***"5. Bail applications.*** - *In every application for bail presented to the High Court the petitioner shall state whether similar application has or has not been made to the Supreme Court, and if made shall state the result thereof. The petitioner/applicant shall also mention whether he/she is/was involved in any other criminal case or not. If yes, particulars and decisions thereof. An application which does not contain this information shall be placed before the bench with the necessary information."*

*23. We feel that every High Court in the country should consider incorporating a similar provision in the respective High Court Rules and/or Criminal Side Rules as it would impose an obligation on the accused to make disclosures regarding his/her involvement in any other criminal cases) previously registered.*



*24. It is, therefore, provided that a copy of this order shall be communicated to the Registrar Generals of all the High Courts so that incorporation of a similar Rule in the respective Rules can be considered, if such provision does not exist from earlier.”*

9. In terms of the above judgment, affidavits are being sought from the Appellants as also the State, as to the details of the criminal antecedents of the person concerned.

10. When convicts are seeking suspension of sentence/bail, repeatedly, adjournments are being sought, as the information concerning criminal antecedents is not readily available. This Court is, *prima facie*, of the view that such delay caused by lack of aforesaid information can be avoided in two ways:

- i) ***Mandatory Disclosure of Criminal Antecedents by Applicants along with suspension of sentence application:*** By directing that the Appellants who preferred the application for suspension of sentence/interim bail ought to file the affidavit disclosing particulars of past involvements and criminal antecedents of Appellant along with the said application itself, so as to obviate repeated adjournments on that ground;
- ii) ***Integration of data with NCRB records:*** The data available with the National Criminal Record Bureau (*hereinafter*, ‘NCRB’) portal, primarily, is stated to be relating to FIRs which are registered by police stations and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom. However, Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri, Id. APP submits that private complaints cases which are straight away dealt with by the Criminal Courts and other cases which are not recorded in the form of FIRs are not reflected on



the NCRB portal. This Court is of the view that even private complaint cases are perused and adjudicated by Criminal Courts within Delhi, and the details of the said cases ought to be mapped with the data available on the NCRB portal, so that information emanating from Criminal Courts is also duly reflected on the NCRB portal.

11. Accordingly, let the office of the Commissioner of Police, Delhi file a status report giving the following details:

- i) The nature and extent of data which is available on the NCRB portal;
- ii) The additional categories of data that could be included on the NCRB portal so that the data of criminal antecedents is available even to Prosecutors and to the Courts, particularly at the stage when applications for suspension of sentence or interim bail are considered;

12. The concerned Director General of Prisons shall also place on record, by way of a status report, whether, at the time of sending the nominal roll, the details of the past cases in which the person concerned is involved, could also be sent along with the nominal roll or after ascertaining the same in the form of an affidavit from the person concerned, and whether such information can be provided in respect of cases where the Appellant is not arrested.

13. The status reports by the office of Commissioner of Police, Delhi and the concerned Director General of Prisons be filed by the next date of hearing.

14. In the present case, let the affidavit be filed by the Appellant by the next date of hearing.

15. For the aforesaid purpose, the concerned Jail Superintendent shall ascertain the details of the criminal antecedents of Appellant and forward the same to the legal aid advocate, who is appearing for the Appellant before this



Court.

16. List this matter on 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2026.

17. Copy of the present order be communicated to the office of the Commissioner of Police, Delhi, Director General of Prisons and the concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary information and compliance.

18. Let the present order be also communicated through Mr. Bahri, Id. APP for the State.

**PRATHIBA M. SINGH**  
**JUDGE**

**MADHU JAIN**  
**JUDGE**

**JANUARY 12, 2026**

*Rahul/sm*