

CNR No. DLCT12–000062–2025
Complaint Case No. 06 of 2025
Complaint u/s. 210(1)(a) r/w 223 BNSS 2023
For offences alleged u/s. 356 BNS
Satyendar Jain v. Karnail Singh

29.05.2026

ORDER ON COGNIZANCE UNDER SECTION 223 r/w SECTION 210
AND
ISSUE OF PROCESS UNDER SECTION 227 OF
THE BHARTIYA NAGARIK SURAKSHA SANHITA, 2023;

Case Background

1. Present complaint was originally filed in February 2025 and after pre-notice evidence was led, proposed accused was issued notice to afford him opportunity of being heard. After hearing both the sides, this Court passed Order on cognizance as well as of issue of process against the accused vide Order dated 06.01.2026.
2. The proposed accused challenged the said Order before the Ld. Special Judge (PC Act) (CBI-23) (MPs/MLAs), wherein vide Order dated 30.04.2026, it was held that –

“... 41. The view taken by the Ld. Trial Court that the applicability of statutory exceptions can be examined only at the stage of trial is not in accordance with law. The issue raised by the revisionist goes to the root of the matter and directly affects the legality of the order issuing process. The Ld. Trial Court was required to undertake a limited examination of the alleged statements, the material on record, and the exceptions pleaded, to determine whether sufficient grounds exist to proceed.

42. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside. The matter is remanded to the Ld. Trial Court to consider the applicability of the exceptions to the alleged statements, in the light of the

observations made herein, and to pass a fresh order in accordance with law...”

3. This Court is thus directed to consider the applicability of the exceptions to the alleged statements. Before discussing the applicability of these exceptions, it therefore would be relevant to state the facts of the complaint in brief.
4. The complainant is an ex-MLA at present (but was an MLA on the date of filing the complaint) from the Shakur Basti Assembly Constituency, Delhi. The proposed accused is a MLA at present from Shakur Basti Assembly, Constituency, Delhi (but was neither a MLA nor a MP on the date of filing the complaint). The allegations in the complaint are that the Shakur Basti is one of the 70 Assemblies that constitute the Delhi Legislative Assembly and since 2013 has been won through elections by complainant Sh. Satyendar Jain. Shakur Basti Constituency in 2025 Delhi Assembly Elections, amongst other candidates, saw a contest between complainant Sh. Satyendar Jain (candidate from Aam Aadmi Party) and respondent no.1 Sh. Karnail Singh (candidate from Bharatiya Janta Party). The elections were announced in January 2025 and in the midst of campaigning, the respondent is alleged to have made defamatory statement. The present complaint was filed on 06.02.2025, election results were announced on 08.02.2025 and respondent came out victorious defeating the second ranked complainant by 20,998 votes. The results are not mentioned in the complaint or respondents' reply, however such information is available on the website of Election Commission of India, which this Court can take judicial notice.

Pre-notice evidence

5. The complainant examined himself as CW1 and he deposed about his goodwill and reputation starting from his profession of practicing architect, then his political career and service as Member of Legislative Assembly in year 2015 and 2020 while representing Shakur Basti Assembly Constituency. He also deposed to have served as Cabinet Minister holding various portfolios of health, home, PWD, power, industries, urban, development, water, transport at different times. CW1 deposed that Sh. Karnail Singh against whom he made a complaint is a big BJP party leader, was contesting election from Shakur Basti Constituency against him and is president of Mandir Prokosht of Bharatiya Janta Party, Delhi Pradesh. CW1 further deposed that during the election campaign when Model Code of Conduct was in place, and no candidate was expected to level any defamatory or false allegations against a rival candidate. On 19.01.2025, Sh. Karnail Singh gave an interview on TV Channel namely Times Now Navbharat and allegedly levelled baseless and false allegations against him to defame and lower his reputation. CW1 exhibited the screen shot and the transcript of the interview as Ex.CW1/1. Subsequently, the complainant issued notice to Sh. Karnail Singh for tendering an apology and copy of the same with delivery proof is Ex.CW1/2. The complainant also deposed that the interview levelled false allegations and he even filed copy of panchnama Ex.CW1/3 prepared by the Directorate of Enforcement (hereinafter referred to as 'ED'). The transcript of the interview is Ex.CW1/1, whereas the interview itself is Ex.CW3/A.
6. Complainant also called in witness box CW2 Sh. Bhanu Gulati, who deposed that he resides within the Shakurbasti Constituency in Delhi and from year 2013 until 2025, the complainant Sh. Satyender Jain was elected member of the Legislative Assembly. He deposed that prior to being elected as an MLA, Mr. Satyender Jain was engaged in the profession of

Architect and during his tenure as an MLA he was serving as Health Minister and PWD Minister. CW2 also deposed that whenever he met the complainant, he used to help in resolving local issues in relation to maintenance of roads, sewer and other related activities. CW2 deposed that he respected complainant for his honesty and hardwork as he himself as well his office used to assist him and other residents of the Shakurbasti Constituency on regular basis without any difficulty/ consideration. CW2 further deposed that in the month of January 2025 just before the Elections for the State of Delhi, he happened to watch a video on youtube uploaded by Times Now Navbharat whereby an interview of Mr. Karnail Singh, who was contesting as rival of complainant. CW2 also deposed that he watched the entire video, being resident of Shakurbasti Constituency whereby Mr. Karnail Singh, in his interview said that during an ED raid conducted, 37 Kgs of Gold and property over 1100 acres was found at the premises of Mr. Satyendra Jain. Mr. Karnail Singh further stated that Mr. Satyendra Jain is involved in corrupt practices. CW2 deposed that after watching such video, he felt extremely betrayed as property over 1100 acres and 37 kgs of Gold could not have been accumulated/ earned by his profession as an Architect or by his salary as a MLA or a Minister. CW2 stated that Sh. Karnail Singh was contesting as a candidate from Shakurbasti Constituency and, he knew he was an educated person who was holding various assets in USA and he believed his words and representations in the interview. CW2 further deposed that representations/ allegations deeply affected the respect and impression that he had for complainant Satyendra Jain considering he believed him to be an honest and upright politician. CW2 also deposed that he stopped respecting Mr. Satyendra Jain afterwards. CW2 then deposed to have met Sh. Satyendra Jain on 30.01.2025 and confronted him with the allegations made by Sh. Karnail Singh, and upon hearing about the allegations, Sh. Satyendra Jain told him that such allegations of recovery of

37 kgs of gold and 1100 acres of property is false. CW2 deposed the complainant even offered to show him the search and seizure memo prepared by ED when he was arrested and when raids were conducted at his premises. CW2 stated the he accepted his offer and perused the search memo on mobile phone of complainant, however CW2 maintained to believe in allegations of Sh. Karnail Singh, who may have some material evidence to make the allegations and he himself was a wealthy man having various assets across the country and USA. CW2 also believed Sh. Karnail Singh as he must be aware of legal process and implications of making representations/ allegations against complainant Sh. Satyendra Jain.

7. The complainant did not examine another witness Sh. Bhuvan Juneja, however moved an application to examine the Editor in-chief of Times Now Navbharat to prove the alleged interview of Sh. Karnail Singh. Summons were issued and in compliance CW3 Sh. Ravikant Rai who was working as Special Correspondent with Times Now Navbharat, Bennet Coleman & Co. Ltd appeared. CW3 was examined and he stated that he conducted an interview with Sh. Karnail Singh on 18.01.2025 and he recorded the video and same was uploaded on youtube channel of Times Now Navbharat at URL link <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vc-gmm5QyeM>. CW3 also brought on record the downloaded video in a pen drive, same is now Ex.CW3/A.

Pre-cognizance notice and opportunity to proposed accused of being heard

8. Following the Orders of the Ld. Special Court, this Court has heard the complainant as well as the proposed accused at this stage before taking cognizance. The complainant has stuck to its original arguments and stated that four specific allegations were levelled in the interview which were

blatantly false and defamatory towards the complainant, the same are as follows: -

- a. “ED recovered 37 KG of gold from his house; he has 1100 Acre of land in his name”
- b. “He made his own wealth from this corruption, from the money which was supposed to be spent on the people”
- c. “He indulged in huge corruption and money laundering; huge gold has been recovered from his house”
- d. “He is bhoo mafia and will be sent to jail again”

9. These are four exact statements translated from the interview given in Hindi Vernacular by the proposed accused. The entire interview is Ex.PW3/A and same has been part of the judicial record. The complainant has reiterated that the imputations made by the proposed accused in the interview are not only false, made to defame the complainant and were published, which are not even related to the press release of the ED as well as the seizure memos of the investigating agencies. The imputations so made were all made up and false to defame complainant with the aim of making political gains. Resultantly many friends, well-wishers, associates and people from his constituency came to meet him and in particularly CW2 Sh. Bhanu Gulati held the complainant in very high esteem and have considered him to be a man of impeccable character with high repute, but confronted the Complainant on 30.01.2025 in view of the interview of proposed accused. The complainant side concluded its argument by stating that all four exceptions cited by the proposed accused shall be subject matter of trial as all requires proof of mental element on part of the proposed accused, which would require positive evidence at the appropriate stage. The complainant thus argues that the allegations of the proposed

accused fulfils all the ingredients of criminal defamation i.e. imputation, publication and intention to cause harm.

10. The proposed accused argued that interview given by the proposed accused was based on wide spread information on internet available in the public domain and were made in good faith for the welfare of the public, for the public good, without any ill-will or malice towards the complainant. The reply further states that statements were made in the context of addressing public concerns related to governance and do not qualify as defamation as they are legitimate right to express concerns as a public figure and a responsible citizen. The reply also states that the statements made are covered under exceptions 1, 2, 3 and 9 to Section 356 of the BNS. The reply also states that in the interview, the proposed accused himself asked the interviewer to verify and thus the responsibility was on the publishing house to report after verifying the statements. The reply also refers to documents i.e. tweet on 'X' social media platform dated 06.06.2022 by Directorate of Enforcement about raid and seizure in connection with case involving the complainant, copy of various news article as well as press release. The reply also refers to judgments of various Hon'ble Constitutional Courts on what would not constitute defamation. The proposed accused has also argued that the complainant being a public servant is subject to public scrutiny and hence the comments made by the proposed accused were his legitimate right to express regarding functioning of state machinery as well as of public servant.
11. Submission heard. File perused.
12. The complaint alleges offence of criminal defamation to have been committed by the proposed accused punishable under Section 356 of the

Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNS'). Criminal defamation requires actus reus of making of an imputation intended to be heard, seen or read, by signs or by visible representation; it also requires mens rea of intention, knowledge or reason to believe that such imputation will harm the reputation. Criminal defamation thus requires three ingredients – imputation, publication and mental element to cause harm. There is no denial from the proposed accused that statements were made by him in an interview given to CW3 which was later published on Times Now Navbharat News Channel. The transcript of the interview is already Ex.CW1/1 and the original interview is Ex.CW3/1. It would be immaterial if the proposed accused published it himself or through news report. As long as proposed accused admits that he gave the interview to a media person which was heard by others and even published on National news channel to be seen by the public there is clearly statements and publication.

13. Now, this Court under the directions of Ld. Special Court vide Order dated 30.04.2026, shall consider if any of the defence under exception to Section 356 of the BNS shall be available to the proposed accused at this stage. The test would be if vide prima facie applicability of the exceptions, from the material placed on record by the complainant, that essential ingredients at this stage are not made out.
14. The complainant has specifically highlighted four statements, which have been recorded above, to be false, defamatory and made with intent to defame by the proposed accused, being political opponent. The complainant even exhibited Ex.CW1/3 i.e. panchnama of search conducted by the Enforcement Directorate at the house of complainant. The defence although cannot be allowed to produce any document at this stage, however in written submission, filed various documents and even news reporting,

which he submits to have been the basis for him to make the statements in interview Ex.CW3/A, transcript of which is Ex.CW1/3.

15. Having considered all these news articles including the press briefings of Enforcement Agency as well, this Court finds that there is no backing to the statements of the proposed accused. In none of the news articles, there is any allegations of 37 KGs of gold being recovered from the residence of the complainant and 1100 Acre property documents in his name. None of these articles show that complainant was declared a 'bhoo mafia'. It was proposed accused's own version to declare the complainant as 'bhoo mafia' as well as to allege that 'complainant has made his own wealth from this corruption, from the money which was supposed to be spent on the people'. Further, it was proposed accused's own statement that 'complainant indulged in huge corruption and money laundering; huge gold has been recovered from his house'. Not only this, the proposed accused said that 'complainant will be sent to jail again'.
16. Yes, the complainant is an accused in CBI cases and ED cases, however he holds a presumption of innocence until convicted and without a formal conviction, he too enjoys all his rights and freedoms guaranteed under the Constitution of India. Merely because complainant has been made accused in certain cases, would not take away his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The debate of retaining criminal defamation in statute books versus Freedom of Speech and Expression has been laid to rest by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in judgment titled **Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India, 2016 INSC 427**. As a natural corollary the proposed accused cannot claim his unabated Freedom of Speech and Expression when he has published unverified, exaggerated, or outright false claim that paints the complainant as guilty before a verdict. The

complainant has equal right to claim his Fundamental Right of Life and Personal Liberty.

17. The proposed accused claims defence in exception 1, 2, 3, and 9 to Section 356 of the BNS. These four exceptions are as under –

Exception 1: It is not defamation to impute anything which is true concerning any person, if it be for the public good that the imputation should be made or published. Whether or not it is for the public good is a question of fact.

Exception 2: It is not defamation to express in good faith any opinion whatever respecting the conduct of a public servant in the discharge of his public functions, or respecting his character, so far as his character appears in that conduct, and no further.

Exception 3: It is not defamation to express in good faith any opinion whatever respecting the conduct of any person touching any public question, and respecting his character, so far as his character appears in that conduct, and no further.

Exception 9: It is not defamation to make an imputation on the character of another provided that the imputation be made in good faith for the protection of the interests of the person making it, or of any other person, or for the public good.

18. During arguments following the Order and directions dated 30.04.2026 of the Ld. Special Judge, the proposed accused reiterated his arguments that complainant does not enjoy impeccable reputation and has already been under allegations of numerous cases of corruption; interview Ex.CW3/A was not live, but pre-recorded and the news channel could have verified the facts before publishing the interview; one of the proposed witness was not examined; there is higher threshold for defamation involving political

rivals; it has been eight years since the allegations emerged against the complainant and in this period huge material online is available which may or may not be verified; the complainant has been selective in his action, when he only preferred case against the proposed accused, but has not taken action to remove any of the content against him online.

19. It is reiterated that mental element to cause harm shall be subject matter of trial. At the stage of taking cognizance and issue of notice to the accused, no court can decide upon the mental element of the proposed accused in making any statement. The exceptions 1, 2, 3 and 9 requires the following to be proved namely – truth; public good; good faith; or due care and attention, as the basis of making the statement/ imputation.
20. Now when the defence relies on the same, there needs to be positive evidence to prove the same. From the records available at this stage i.e. complaint, pre-notice evidence and exhibits, there is no truth when proposed accused specifically alleged that 37 KGs of gold and 1100 acre of land documents in name of complainant were recovered from his house and he further imputed that complainant was 'bhoo mafia'. Ex.CW1/2 i.e. panchnama of search conducted at the residence of complainant does not show any of such recovery and even if it is assumed that alleged recovery was made in connection with complainant's link to the case, then also there is no truth that exactly 37 KGs of gold and 1100 acre of land documents were recovered. To substantiate the defence, the accused would need to prove the exception 1, to be available to him, at the appropriate stage for the same would be defence evidence.
21. Further, the argument of the defence that proposed accused was merely giving opinion on a public functionary or conduct of public servant, which

was done in good faith. It again shall be matter of trial by positive evidence that proposed accused acted in good faith. The interview was given on 19.01.2026 and by that time the proposed accused was already announced as opposition candidate to the complainant from same Shakurpur Basti constituency, of which complainant was two time sitting MLA. Even the interviewer CW3, in Ex.CW3/A and transcript Ex.CW1/3 introduced the proposed accused as opposing candidate to the complainant. In such eventuality, it shall be upon the proposed accused to prove by positive evidence that he made imputation in good faith on working of public servant. It is at the cost of repetition reiterated that the proposed accused imputed that complainant is 'bhoo mafia', 'his house was searched by the ED and 37 KGs as well as 1100 acre property documents were recovered', and 'he has amassed huge wealth through corruption and soon will be in jail again'. These prima facie does not show to be opinion on working of a public servant, rather direct imputation. It is again repetition that at this stage, there is no material from any of the pending case against the complainant or news reporting that above material in that exact value was recovered from the house of the complainant. Thus exception 2 and 3, as available to the proposed accused, shall again require positive evidence at the appropriate stage.

22. Lastly, the exception 9 to Section 356 of the BNS requires opinion as to character of another provided that the imputation be made in good faith for the protection of the interests of the person making it, or of any other person, or for the public good. Here again the interview Ex.CW3/A and transcript Ex.CW1/3 is seen, this Court shall caution itself in giving liberal interpretation to the exception at this stage. As already stated, the proposed accused was opposing candidate and contesting against the complainant from Shakurpur Basti Assembly Constituency to Delhi Legislative

Assembly. In such scenario, it cannot be held at this stage of the case that imputation made by the proposed accused was in good faith for protection of interest of the person making it or for public good.

23. There are two illustration to Exception 9, which provides some guidance on application of this exception. These two illustrations are –

(a) A, a shopkeeper, says to B, who manages his business “Sell nothing to Z unless he pays you ready money, for I have no opinion of his honesty.” A is within the exception, if he has made this imputation on Z in good faith for the protection of his own interests.

(b) A, a Magistrate, in making a report to his own superior officer, casts an imputation on the character of Z. Here, if the imputation is made in good faith, and for the public good, A is within the exception.

24. The illustration would make it amply clear that the test of good faith and public good, requires proof that they were made as such. This would require positive evidence and not mere oral submission. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the proposed accused had argued and it is part of written submission that before the interview he did not much know the complainant. He also argued that his knowledge about complainant was limited to news articles and social media information about him. Yet once he is declared as opposing candidate to the complainant from same constituent assembly, he chose to represent the people of the constituency, if elected. This casts a greater duty upon the proposed accused to make statements about other with caution and greater care. Any imputation upon the opposing candidate in the middle of the election campaign would directly be a advantage to the proposed accused and thus at this stage, good faith on his part shall be subject matter of trial

and positive evidence, rather than mere oral submission at this nascent stage of the case.

25. The proposed accused himself understands this duty of care and caution. He has argued since beginning that he gave the interview and even cast duty upon the interviewer CW3 that he was a journalist and he should himself see about the allegations/ imputation made by him. It is the argument of the proposed accused that he was busy with his election work, when the interviewer suddenly came on the road and asked him questions. Yet when proposed accused made statement, he cautioned the reporter to verify before printing.
26. This Court finds this argument as countering the defence itself. It implies that the proposed accused made statements/ imputation of which he himself could not verify the details. For this reason he cautioned the reporter to publish after verifying. This would itself imply that the proposed accused without any basis made statement that 37 KGs was recovered from the complainant and 1100 Acre property documents was in his name.

ORDER

27. Section 210 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS') provides conditions requisite for initiation of proceedings wherein any Magistrate of the first class, may take cognizance of any offence upon receiving a complaint of facts, including any complaint filed by a person authorised under any special law, which constitutes such offence. The other requisite required are provided under Section 223 of the BNSS, wherein the Court is required to examine the complainant and witnesses on oath. The complainant has examined himself as CW1, CW2 who heard the imputation and CW3 who showed that the interview by

proposed accused was published and available to general public. The Proviso to Section 223 of the BNSS however requires that the Court gives opportunity to be heard before cognizance is taken. All the requisites stand satisfied as per the provisions of law and the present complaint of facts thus is required to proceed as per law. **This Court thus takes cognizance of the offence under Section 210 r/w 223 of the BNSS.**

28. Section 227 of the BNSS provides for Issue of Process against accused where a Magistrate forms an opinion that sufficient grounds to proceed against an accused exists after taking cognizance of the complaint of facts. Here the word 'opinion' is deliberately used since what is required is opinion to proceed and not prima facie, which is required when inquiry stage goes into trial. At this stage of inquiry, the only extent of requirement under the law, for the Court to see is opinion about sufficient grounds to proceed against an accused.
29. The complaint specifically alleges that the imputations were made at the office of proposed accused where workers were present and same was made in an interview to a news channel which published the same and same was heard by many persons. The complaint alleges that many persons in his constituency confronted the complainant about the allegations of 37 KG gold having been recovered from his house as well as 1100 Acre land was in his name which was from corrupt practices and complainant was labelled as 'bhoo mafia'. The complaint alleges that these imputations thus were false, intended to be heard with mens rea to cause harm to the reputation of the complainant and hence liable to be tried for the offence of defamation. Reference is made to Ex.CW1/3 i.e. Panchnama of ED dated 07.06.2022 qua the search and seizure memo at the house of the complainant which mentions seizure of various documents, one digital

device along-with two locker keys and currency notes totalling Rs.2,79,000/-. This panchnama does not refer to any recovery of 37 KG gold and property documents of 1100 Acres of land as alleged by the proposed accused in his interview/ alleged statement. During the arguments, the proposed accused stated that the ED also searched the houses of co-accused and accomplice of the complainant during investigation and from such investigation there was recovery of 133 gold coins, Rs.2.85 Crores in cash as well as some incriminating documents. It is the argument thus that there was various news circulating that all this recovery was from the house of the complainant and based on this information, he made statements in the interview. The proposed accused wished to rely on the documents filed by him with the reply. This Court would again caution itself not to look at the documents filed by the proposed accused at this stage of inquiry. However, a simple peek into these documents of proposed accused itself would be detrimental to proposed accused himself. The documents are from ED's post on social media platform and various news following the raids by the ED in 2022. The ED's post itself says 133 coins weighed 1.80 KG in total and news report clarifies that in none of the post by the ED, it is mentioned the source from where they were recovered. One of the reports even shows that ED made no statement that recoveries were made from the house of the complainant. If this Court is to read the document filed by the proposed accused any further, the arguments can be easily countered, however this Court would reserve the said exercise for trial.

30. All the judgments cited by the proposed accused would show that the exercising Fundamental Right of Free Speech, which are part of Fundamental Rights are sacrosanct to an individual however, same are subjected to reasonable restrictions as well as cannot be used to deny

other's Fundamental Right. The constitutionality of criminal defamation has been upheld by the Apex Court in **Subramanian Swamy case (Supra)**. This Court however, with case at hand has different complaint of fact. The statements made by proposed accused as shown in the transcript Ex.CW1/1 and specific imputation aimed at the complainant to his personal character. Such statements found no backing from any information available in public domain. The complainant exhibited copy of panchnama Ex.CW1/3, prepared by ED while it conducted search at his residence, and there was no recovery of cash, gold or property documents as alleged by the proposed accused. The information was thus either concocted by the proposed accused or deliberately exaggerated as he was contesting against the complainant from the same constituency.

31. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia & Anr. Etc. v. State of Punjab, AIR 1980 SC 1632**, speaking through a Constitution Bench implicitly recognized a link between Article 21 and the presumption of innocence. Next in **Sahara India Real Estate Corp. Ltd. & Ors v. SEBI & Anr., AIR 2012 SC 3829**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court specifically held that presumption of innocence is embedded in Part III of the Constitution 'not only as part of rule of law under Article 14 but also as an Article 21'. The Hon'ble Apex Court even went further and laid down that to uphold the rule of equality and right to life, even freedom of speech under Article 19(1)(a) can be restricted. The context of making such remark was to protect an individual from dangers posed by a media trial.
32. In the present case, the proposed accused was contesting as an opposition to the complainant from same constituency and hence the statements ought to have been made with a higher degree of care and caution. The proposed accused made statement to the media persons and then asked them to

exercise caution before publishing the same. The proposed accused however, himself did not bother to check his facts before giving the interview. The facts stated by him in the complaint, are not backed by any ED statement, press release or information in public domain. It appears the proposed accused made statement with his own facts and figures, wherein the mental element of proposed accused shall be subject matter of trial, as also if same is covered under any exception to criminal defamation under law.

33. From the detailed discussion above and given that the requirements of law under Section 210, 223, 227 of the BNSS are complied with. **There are sufficient grounds to proceed. This Court therefore directs Issue of Process against the accused Sh. Karnail Singh under Section 227 of the BNSS.**

Pronounced in the Open
Court on 29.05.2026

[PARAS DALAL]
ACJM-01, RADC
New Delhi