

41# \$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(CRL) 700/2011

NAND KISHORE @ NANDU @ KARATE Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sachin Aggarwal, Advocate.

versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Mahajan, Additional
Standing Counsel with SI Parveen
Kumar, PS Sultan Puri, Delhi.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA****ORDER**

%

25.11.2011

By this petition the Petitioner seeks appropriate directions for the safeguard of the life, liberty, property and freedom of the Petitioner at the hands of Special Staff of Outer District and Staff of Rohini Sector-1.

The grievance of the Petitioner is that the Petitioner was earlier implicated in a false case and subsequently on 10th February, 2011 he was again falsely implicated in three cases. Thereafter the Petitioner was released on bail in all the three cases on 29th April, 2011. Once the Petitioner was released on bail in the month of April, 2011 some police officials of Special Staff of Outer District and Staff of Rohini Sector-1 surrounded the house of the Petitioner and visited the house of the Petitioner in odd hours, pressurizing, threatening and harassing his wife and other family members to not allow the Petitioner to reside in Delhi.

On a notice being issued a status report has been filed.

As per the status report, the Petitioner is involved in as many as 28

W.P.(CRL) 700/2011**Page 1 of 2**

4

cases and on 11th February, 2011 also he was arrested in FIR No. 69/2011 under Section 399/402 IPC read with Section 25/54/59 Arms Act registered at PS Prashant Vihar, Delhi. As per the status report no police officials of the Special Staff either visited the house of Nand Kishore @ Nandu or contacted any of his family members. Even as per the SHO, PS Sultanpuri, the Petitioner was not found residing at the given address in Sultanpuri as surveillance has to be kept on his activities because the Petitioner is a bad character of PS Sultanpuri.

The petition before this Court and the complaint which has been filed to the Commissioner of Police is absolutely vague. It does not disclose either the date, time and when the police officials visited, the description of the police officials and what they stated.

I find no merit in the petition.

The petition is dismissed.

In case the Petitioner has any grievance of the police officer committing any offence, he would be at liberty to file an appropriate complaint before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate under Section 200 Cr.P.C..


MUKTA GUPTA, J.

NOVEMBER 25, 2011
'vn'