

Arvind Sharma and Anr. vs State of Nct of Delhi and Ors.

Arvind Sharma and Anr. vs State of Nct of Delhi and Ors.

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1255250

Court : Delhi Orders

Decided On : Jan-30-2026

Judge : Hon'Ble Mr. Justice Prateek Jalan

Appeal No. : W.P.(CRL)/332/2026

Appellant : Arvind Sharma and Anr.

Respondent : State of Nct of Delhi and Ors.

Advocate for Def. : Mr. Rahul Tyagi, Mr. Sangeet Sibon, Mr. Aniket Kumar Singh, Mr. Priyansh Raj Singh

Advocate for Pet/Ap. : Mr. Mukul Sharma

Judgement :

\$~96 * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI + W.P.(CRL) 332/2026 & CRL.M.A. 3217/2026 ARVIND SHARMA AND ANR.Petitioners Through: Mr. Mukul Sharma, Advocate. versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.Respondents Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC (Criminal) with Mr. Sangeet Sibon, Mr. Aniket Kumar Singh & Mr. Priyansh Raj Singh, Advocates SI Sachin Jaswal, PS Sarai Rohilla. SI Nitesh Mahija, PS Sagarpur. ASI Devender Singh, Parvi Officer, Insp. Sanjay Sharma, Tilak Nagar. ASI Bripal, Tilak Nagar CORAM: HONBLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN ORDER % 30.01.2026 1. The petitioners have approached this Court by

way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, with a grievance which has its genesis in the blacklisting of the vehicle belonging to petitioner No. 1 [DL-10-SU-3355] on the ground that it is a stolen vehicle. 2. As a result of the blacklisting of the vehicle, the petitioners were unable to obtain a Pollution Under Control Certificate [PUCC]. Consequently, two challans dated 17.01.2026, have been issued arising out of the aforesaid violation, which are showing on the traffic police portal, i.e. one to the petitioner No.1, as the owner of the vehicle, and other to the petitioner No. 2 as driver of the vehicle. In fact, Mr. Mukul

W.P.(CRL) 332/2026 Page 1 of 2

This is a digitally signed order. The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above. The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/02/2026 at 12:37:23 Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the petitioner has now received a third challan in respect of the same violation. 3. Mr. Sharma submits that the petitioners vehicle has, in fact, been registered in the name of petitioner No. 1, and has not been stolen. Despite repeated inquiries, the petitioners are not getting any clear information as to the reason for the blacklisting of the vehicle. 4. Mr. Rahul Tyagi, learned Additional Standing Counsel, who appears on advance notice, submits, upon instruction, that blacklisting of vehicle arose out as an e-FIR registered by an unrelated party, in which the registration number of the petitioners vehicle number was erroneously mentioned as the stolen vehicle. He further submits that they have since verified the petitioners documents, and ascertained that the petitioners vehicle is not required to be blacklisted. He therefore submits that necessary steps will be taken to remove the petitioners vehicle from the blacklisting list. 5. Consequently, Mr. Tyagi also submits that if the petitioners approach the concerned Court for the cancellation of the challans in respect of the PUCC, the respondent will not oppose the cancellation of challans. 6. The writ petition, alongwith pending application, stands disposed of, binding the respondent to these submissions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J JANUARY 30, 2026 pv/AD/

W.P.(CRL) 332/2026 Page 2 of 2

This is a digitally signed order. The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above. The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/02/2026 at 12:37:23

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com