



\$~11

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Date of decision: 4th February, 2026

Uploaded on: 6th February, 2026.

+

CRL.A. 251/2025

PARVEEN TANEJA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Sudarshan Rajan (DHCLSC), Mr.
Hitain Bajaj, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri, APP with
Ms. Divya Yadav and Mr. Lalit
Luthra, Advs. with Dr. R.S. Gupta
SI Satish Chandra

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

Prathiba M. Singh, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CRL.A. 251/2025

2. On the last date of hearing i.e., 12th January, 2026, this Court had referred to the orders passed by the Supreme Court in '**Kaushal Singh vs. The State of Rajasthan**' 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1473, as also in **Criminal Appeal No. 632/2022** titled '**Jagjeet Singh & Ors. v. Ashish Mishra @ Monu & Anr.**', wherein the Court had considered that the details of criminal antecedents of the persons seeking bail are required to be furnished. In the said context, this Court has observed as under:

"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.”

3. In terms of the above order, this Court had observed that if the data from the Courts dealing with the criminal cases is also integrated with the National Criminal Record Bureau (*hereinafter*, ‘NCRB’) portal there would be a comprehensive source for accessing information relating to criminal antecedents of accused as also the convicts.

4. In this context, the Court had called for status reports from the Director General of Prisons, Delhi as also from the Commissioner of Police, Delhi.

5. Today, status reports have been filed by both the aforesaid authorities.



The same are taken on record.

(i) Status report on behalf of Director General of Prisons, Delhi

6. The status report has been filed by the Superintendent of Prison Headquarters, Tihar, New Delhi which records as under:

“2. That it is respectfully submitted that Delhi Prisons has been maintaining a Prison Management System (PMS) since the year 2004, wherein details of inmates are recorded, including inter alia their personal particulars, case details, warrant particulars, custody status and jail movement.

3. That while preparing Nominal Rolls and court replies, the Jail Authorities primarily rely upon the following official records:

i. Data available in the Prison Management System (PMS);and

ii.The Undertrial (UT) Register and Convict (CT) Register maintained in the respective sections of the jail.

4. That through the aforesaid records, the Jail Authorities are in a position to ascertain and furnish information relating to:

a) Criminal cases in which the inmate is presently lodged in custody; and

b) Criminal cases in respect of which production warrants are received during the period of incarceration of the inmate.

5. That it is respectfully submitted that, apart from the above, the Prison Administration does not have any independent, centralised or real-time mechanism to verify or access information relating to all other pending criminal cases against an inmate:



- I. Where the inmate has not been arrested;*
- II. Where no production warrants have been received; and*
- III. Where such cases are not reflected in jail records or PMS data.*
- IV. Where such cases are prior to year 2004*

6. That with regard the suggestion obtaining information to concerning criminal antecedents by way of an affidavit from of the prisoner and including this in Nominal Roll, it is respectfully submitted that Inmates being confined in prison, may themselves not be in possession of complete, accurate or verifiable information regarding all past or pending cases, particularly those not resulting in arrest, custody or production before court.

7. That in view of the aforesaid limitations, it is respectfully submitted that information relating to criminal cases in which the appellant/convict has not been arrested or produced cannot, at present, be verified or furnished by the Jail Authorities with the requisite certainty, accuracy or authenticity.

8. That it is further submitted that Delhi Prisons remains committed to assisting this Hon'ble Court and shall comply with any further directions or institutional mechanism that may be evolved at the appropriate level, in coordination with other stakeholder departments, for facilitating availability of verified criminal antecedent.”

7. A perusal of the status report on behalf of the Director General of Prisons, Delhi shows that the Delhi Prisons have been maintaining a ‘Prison



Management System (hereinafter, 'PMS') since 2004, wherein details of inmates are recorded, including personal particulars, warrants details, case details along with nominal rolls etc.

8. The status report clarifies that the following data is available on the database:

- (i) Criminal cases in which the person is taken into custody;
- (ii) Criminal cases in respect of which production warrants are received during the incarceration of the inmate.

9. It is contended that there are various other categories of cases, where the relevant data is not available on the database. The same have been categorized in paragraph 5 of the status report extracted hereinabove. As per the same, the data relating to the following cases is not available:

- I. Where the inmate has not been arrested;*
- II. Where no production warrants have been received; and*
- III. Where such cases are not reflected in jail records or PMS data.*
- IV. Where such cases are prior to year 2004*

10. Additionally, it is further contended that whatever information of criminal antecedents is available is sent along with nominal roll. However, the said data may not contain all the information pertaining to the criminal antecedents, inasmuch as data relating to the complaint cases and those cases pending before the Courts are not presently integrated.

(ii) Status report on behalf of the office of Commissioner of Police, Delhi

11. The office of the Commissioner Delhi Police through Deputy Commissioner of Police - Mr. Aditya Gautam has filed the present status report. In terms of the same, details have been provided about the data that



is available on the NCRB portal. The said status report reads as under:

“2. Point No. 11 (i): Nature and Extent of Data Available on NCRB Portal: It is further submitted that data relating to the criminal antecedents of accused persons, along with other relevant information is shared with the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) by Delhi Police through the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network & Systems (CCTNS) and is subsequently reflected in the Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System (ICJS)

3. That the ICJS integrates data of the Police, Courts, Prosecution, Forensic Science Laboratories (FSLs), and Prisons. The system provides facilities for searching for the status of an accused through the following three modes: -

a. **Court Search**- which includes details such as State, District, Establishment, name of the accused, Case Number (CNR), Act/Section, and FIR Registration Number, and reflects the status of cases pending against the searched accused on a pan-India basis;

b. **Police Search** - which includes details such as FIR Number, Police Station, Date of Registration, Parentage, Name of the Investigating Officer, Status of Investigation, Address of the Accused and reflects previous criminal involvement of the searched accused on a pan-India basis;

c. **Prison Search** - which includes details such as Jail State, Jail Name, Prisoner Name, Parentage, Mother/Spouse Name, or Prisoner ID, and reflects whether the accused is currently lodged in prison or released,

4. It is respectfully submitted that the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), Ministry of



Home Affairs (MHA), Government of India collects criminal data through a centralized, technology-driven system. At present, NCRB primarily captures FIR-based criminal cases, and complaint cases are not reflected in its database. It is further submitted that the NCRB is the Competent Authority to provide a detailed account of the nature and extent of data collected through the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network & Systems (CCTNS).

5. Point No. 11 (ii): Additional Categories of Data Proposed: It is respectfully submitted that, at present, the data reflected on the NCRB Portal and the ICJS platform is largely confined to FIR-based criminal cases fed through the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network & Systems (CCTNS) by the Police. While this mechanism ensures systematic capture of FIR-related information, complaint cases which do not culminate in the registration of an FIR are presently not reflected in the centralized NCRB database.

6. It is respectfully submitted that, as a matter of policy and for ensuring a more comprehensive criminal justice data ecosystem, the scope of data captured by the NCRB may be expanded to include complaint cases pending or decided before the competent courts. This objective can be practically and effectively achieved through structured coordination between the NCRB and the Court Registries, whereby the Court Registries may digitally feed limited but relevant particulars of complaint cases, such as case number (CNR), name and parentage of the accused, nature of offence, stage of proceedings and the final outcome, into a designated module



of the ICJS .

7. That such a court-registry-driven data integration would ensure authenticity, prevent duplication, and maintain judicial accuracy, while simultaneously enabling the NCRB with the help of National Informatics Centre (NIC) to maintain an inclusive and updated national repository of criminal case data. Upon integration, the said data can be made accessible to the Courts, Prosecution and Investigating Agencies through the ICJS, thereby enabling a complete and consolidated view of all cases relating to an accused person, whether FIR-based or complaint-based. Further, NCRB and NIC are the custodians for maintaining and reflecting data in ICJS for all pillars. The complaint cases will be a part of ICJS search after the intervention of NCRB and NIC.

8. That it is further submitted that the aforesaid policy-level integration would significantly enhance informed judicial decision-making, assist the prosecution in placing correct antecedent information before the Court without delay, and strengthen inter-institutional coordination within the criminal justice system.”

12. A perusal of the above status report would reveal that the NCRB data integrates the data from the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network and Systems (*hereinafter*, ‘CCTNS’) as also the Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System (*hereinafter*, ‘ICJS’). The ICJS integrates data from Police, Courts, Prosecution, Forensic Science Laboratories, and Prisons.

13. Mr. Mukesh Rathi, ACP, Delhi Police, who is present in Court submits that there are three possible searches that can be carried out on the ICJS



platform, including Court Search, Police Search and Prison Search. However, the data is largely confined to FIR based criminal cases which are fed into the CCTNS by the police.

14. Further, the status report also clarifies that there are two types of cases for which the data is not reflected:

- (i) Complaint cases which do not result in the culmination of the FIR;
- (ii) Complaint cases which are pending or decided by the Competent Courts.

15. Thus, the Commissioner of Police, Delhi is of the opinion that the comprehensive criminal justice data ecosystem would be strengthened if the data captured by the NCRB can be expanded to include the aforesaid types of cases also.

16. Heard. In the light of the two status reports that have been placed on record today, this Court is of the opinion that steps ought to be explored for integrating data on the NCRB portal, relating to complaint cases which do not result in FIRs as also complaint cases which are pending or decided by the competent Courts.

17. Accordingly, issue notice to Director, NCRB as also DDG, NIC with whom the NCRB data base is being managed. Let the aforesaid authorities file status reports as to whether any steps have been contemplated for integrating the following data on the NCRB portal and if so, whether any department is looking into the matter or not:

- (i) Pending criminal cases against the Prison inmates, apart from the case in which they are lodged in jail;
- (ii) Complaint cases which do not result in FIRs;



(ii) Complaint cases which are pending or decided by the competent Courts.

18. Let the status reports be filed by the next date of hearing.

19. In the facts of the present case, a perusal of the order on sentence dated 10th January, 2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, (FTC)-02, South-East District, Saket Courts, New Delhi would reveal that the matter was referred to the Delhi Legal Service Authority (*hereinafter*, 'DLSA'), South East for awarding compensation to the family of the deceased and the complainant.

20. Accordingly, let a Status report be filed by DLSA, South East as to whether compensation has been calculated and any disbursement has been made or not.

21. The father of the deceased is present in Court and his details are as under:

- i) Name : Nem Pal
- ii) Mobile No. : +91 8448604876

22. The Secretary DLSA, South East shall interact with the complainant on the above mobile no. and then make a recommendation to the Court in respect of the future prospects for both the children of the deceased – who are the grandchildren of the Complainant.

23. Copy of this order shall be served by the Registry upon the Director, NCRB and the DDG, NIC through the following email addresses:

- **Director NCRB:** director@ncrb.gov.in
- **DDG, NIC:** jdcctns@ncrb.gov.in

24. Copy of this order shall be communicated to the DLSA, South East for necessary information and compliance.



25. List on 16th April, 2026.

CRL.M.(BAIL) 451/2025 (for suspension of sentence)

26. The present application has been filed by the Appellant under Section 430 read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking suspension of sentence and release of Appellant on bail during the pendency of the present appeal.

27. The Trial Court has convicted the Appellant for offences punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 *vide* the order on conviction dated 30th September, 2024 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, (FTC)-02 , South-East District, Saket Courts, New Delhi. This was followed by the order on sentence dated 10th January, 2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, (FTC)-02, South-East District, Saket Courts, New Delhi by which the Appellant was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life and fine of Rs. 50,000/- was also imposed.

28. It is the order of conviction as also the order on sentence which has been challenged by the Appellant in the present appeal. At present, however, the Court is only considering the application for suspension of sentence filed by the Appellant.

29. The present application has been filed by the Appellant on the ground that the Appellant has served more than 8 years 6 months of incarceration.

30. Mr. Sudarshan Rajan, Id. Counsel for the Appellant has vehemently argued that the Appellant and the deceased wife had a love marriage. There are no finger prints which exist on the knife or on the gas cylinder which are stated to be the tools used to murder the deceased. It is further submitted that the Appellant has served a long period of incarceration and does not have any criminal antecedents. Moreover, it is also submitted that his record in the jail



has also been satisfactory. Thus, it is prayed that the sentence of the Appellant may be suspended and he shall be released on bail.

31. On the other hand, Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri, Id. APP has taken the Court through the testimonies of PW-3 *i.e.*, the father of the deceased as also PW-4 *i.e.*, the minor child of the deceased, who have confirmed the presence of the Appellant at the crime scene.

32. The Court has heard the Id. Counsels for the parties and perused the records. PW-3 and PW-4 have confirmed the presence of the Appellant at the crime scene. Moreover, the photographs of the crime scene which have been placed on record reveals the manner in which the deceased was brutally murdered. After having perused the evidence, at this stage, the Court is not inclined to suspend the sentence of the Appellant, at this stage.

33. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE

MADHU JAIN
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 4, 2026

dj/prg/sm