



\$~84

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Decision: 13th August, 2026

CNR No. DLHC010374142026

+ CRL.M.C. 5934/2026 & CRL.M.A. 24727/2026 & CRL.M.A. 24728/2026

ASHISH RAHEJA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mudit Jain with Ms. Mahima Malhotra, Mr. Harjai Singh Gujral and Mr. Vaibhav Bahl, Advocates.

versus

M/S LEO ISPAT LTD. & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shakeel Sarwar Wani with Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocates with AR of respondents (through V.C.)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner herein is facing prosecution in ten different complaints filed under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. With respect to six such complaints, the complainant is *M/s Leo Ispat Ltd.* whereas in rest of the four complaints, the complainant is *M/s Leo Ispat*, a proprietary concern.
2. Petitioner herein had filed an application seeking clubbing of the cases and joinder of trial of all such complaints, which request has been declined.
3. Such order is under challenge.
4. Learned counsel for the respondents/complainants appears on advance notice and submits that when the matter was pending before the learned Trial Court, he had given concession that the six complaints pertaining to *M/s Leo Ispat Ltd.* can be clubbed together and the remaining four complaints filed by *M/s Leo Ispat* can be clubbed together separately but the petitioner was insisting for clubbing of all the ten complaints. He submits that said six complaints pertain to loan transaction whereas the other four pertain to



business transaction.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents reiterates that he would have no objection to the clubbing and joinder of trial in terms of what he had earlier mentioned before the learned Trial Court and what is already recorded in para 12 of the impugned order.

6. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would not insist for clubbing of all the ten complaints and would not have objection to abovesaid proposal. He, therefore, seeks to withdraw the present petition with liberty to permit him to address arguments afresh in this regard.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with request to the learned Trial Court to reconsider the aboveaid application in light of what has been stated today by the learned counsel for the parties and to pass appropriate order, in accordance with law, without being influenced by the observations appearing in the impugned order.

8. It is, however, clarified that since the case is fixed for tomorrow for the purposes of recording of cross-examination, the petitioner herein would render due assistance to the learned Trial Court so that, once the application is disposed of, the testimony is also recorded. This is, however, subject to the convenience of the Board of the learened Trial Court.

9. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

10. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

11. Copy of the order be given *dasti* under signatures of Court Master.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

AUGUST 13, 2026/st/js