

(2026) 08 DEL CK 3858

In the Delhi High Court, Principal Bench, New Delhi

Case No : W.P.(CRL) 2291/2026, CRL.M.A. 23091/2026 & CRL.M.A. 23092/2026

Jagtar Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State (NCT Of Delhi) & Anr.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-08-2026

Acts Referred:

RTI Act

Citation : (2026) 08 DEL CK 3858

Hon'ble Judges : Girish Kathpalia, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mr. Yash Prakash Yadav, Mr. Gaurav Mann, Ms. Kavya Arora, Mr. C.B. Garg, Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

1. For convenience, the prayer clause of this petition is extracted below:

"I. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent authorities to file, a reply on affidavit to representation sent by the petitioner towards his representation dated 12.06.2026 posted on 20.06.2026 & thus ensuring a fair, impartial and lawful investigation in FIR No. 0083/2026 dated 25.03.2026 registered at Police Station Rajinder Nagar.

II. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent authorities to explain, on the basis of the Case Diary, original complaint, PCR/112 records and all contemporaneous material, how and under whose authority the contents of FIR No. 0083/2026 came to materially differ from the actual narration made by the petitioner regarding the occurrence and the weapon used.

III. Direct an independent inquiry by a senior officer not below the rank of ACP/DCP into the conduct of the Investigating Officer in recording a false and materially different narration in the FIR by substituting the weapon of offence from "knife" to "stone/tile", thereby allegedly favouring the accused persons.

IV. Direct Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to produce before this Hon'ble Court the original complaint of the petitioner, the original DD entries, the 112 PCR recording, the MLC, the Case Diary and all documents on the basis of which the Investigating Officer recorded the

impugned narration in the FIR, so that this Hon'ble Court may ascertain how the petitioner's version regarding repeated stabbing by a knife came to be substituted by an allegation of assault with a stone.

V. Pass any other order(s) which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice."

2. Learned counsel for petitioner contends that the petitioner had lodged a complaint that he had been assaulted with knife, but in the FIR, the weapon of offence was described as stone. It is contended that the local police toned down the offence by replacing "knife" with "stone".

3. It is further submitted by learned counsel for petitioner that the petitioner lodged a complaint with the respondents as regards the said discrepancy, but his representation dated 12.06.2026 has not been responded to till date, so he has filed the present petition.

4. Going by the above submissions, I directed the Investigating Officer/SI Vikesh Kumar who has appeared along with learned ASC to show me the investigation file. The investigation file contains *asal tehrir* (*first signed statement of the complainant/petitioner*) along with *rukka* (*endorsement of the Investigating Officer*). The *asal tehrir*, duly signed by the petitioner describes the weapon of offence as stone and not knife.

5. Be that as it may, apparently by way of this writ petition, what petitioner is trying to do is to collect material in support of his allegation against the Investigating Officer. For that, the petitioner could always seek information from police authorities under RTI Act limited to prayer clause (I) instead of seeking to invoke writ jurisdiction. Besides, it is submitted by learned ASC that the Investigating Officer who had got the FIR registered has already been transferred out and now the matter is being investigated by the current Investigating Officer.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that "*tehrir* was not within knowledge of the petitioner". But as mentioned above, petitioner signed the *tehrir*. However, on this aspect, it is stated by learned counsel for petitioner, on instructions of petitioner present in court that the signatures on *tehrir* are not of the petitioner.

7. The petition is not just devoid of merits, but completely frivolous, so dismissed.

8. Accompanying applications also stand disposed of.