

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).6125/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 24-03-2026 in WPCRL No. 1845/2025 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

LALU PRASAD YADAV

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Respondent(s)

IA No. 104562/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 13-04-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Varun Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Navin Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Satish Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Sumit Singh, Adv.  
Ms. Aprajita Jamwal, Adv.  
Ms. Janvi Narang, Adv.  
Mr. Arun Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Mudit Gupta, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Suryaprakash V Raju, A.S.G.  
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR  
Mr. Zoheb Hossian, Adv.  
Mr. Samrat Goswami, Adv.  
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.  
Mr. Arkaj Kumar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

We have heard the learned Senior Counsel Mr. Kapil Sibal appearing for the petitioner and the learned

A.S.G. Mr. SV Raju appearing for the respondent - CBI.

Two issues have been raised before us. The first issue is with respect to the scope and applicability of Section 17-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (hereinafter referred to as 'the PC Act') to the facts of the instant case, and the other issue, being incidental in nature, is with respect to whether Section 17-A of the PC Act is prospective or retrospective in nature.

Learned ASG, appearing for the respondent - CBI, submitted that the alleged act committed by the petitioner was not in discharge of his official duty and, hence, the mandate of Section 17-A of the PC Act is not applicable to the facts of the instant case. Learned Senior Counsel, appearing for the petitioner, submitted that the said submission is nothing but an afterthought and was not the contention of the respondent - CBI before the High Court.

Having heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned ASG appearing for the respondent - CBI, we do not wish to interfere with the impugned order except to state that both the aforesaid issues are left open in order to be raised and decided at the appropriate stage during the course of trial.

Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the appearance of the petitioner before the Trial Court is dispensed with, unless the same is specifically required by the Trial Court.

We also make it clear that the observations made by the High Court in the impugned order shall not have any bearing

on the trial.

The Special Leave Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(MOHD IBRAHIM)  
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(NIKITA SINGH)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)