

ITEM NO.31

COURT NO.11

SECTION II-A

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).405/2021

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 02-11-2019 in CRR No.5185/2019 passed by the High Court Of M.P Principal Seat At Jabalpur)

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, BHOPAL

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ABHISHEK SACHAN @ ABHISHEK SINGH

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. )

Date : 06-07-2023 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HRISHIKESH ROY  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ MITHAL

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Vikramjeet Banerjee, A.S.G.  
Mr. Sharath Nambiar, Adv.  
Mr. Divyansh H Rathi, Adv.  
Mr. Siddharth Sinha, Adv.  
Ms. Sweksha, Adv.  
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. The Office Report indicates that although notice was duly served on the respondent (accused), he has failed to enter his appearance.
2. Adverting to the matter in hand, Mr. Vikramjeet Banerjee, learned Additional Solicitor General submits that

the issue to be considered here is whether supplying of hard copies of the documents relied on by the Prosecution, is mandatory, for ensuring fair trial. The counsel would rely on *P. Gopalkrishnan alias Dileep vs. State of Kerala and Another* [(2020) 9 SCC 161].

3. The counsel for the CBI would also advert to Section 4 of the Indian Technology Act, 2000 and also Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to contend that supplying of documents in digital format is permissible, under the Indian Laws and, therefore, the High Court was in error in upholding the direction issued by the Special Judge ordering for supply of hard copies of the concerned documents to the accused.

4. Be that as it may, as the respondent is not represented, the matter be listed after four weeks.

(DEEPAK JOSHI)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(KAMLESH RAWAT)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR