

\$~9

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3683/2011**

MOHD. ISRAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE AND ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajeshwar Rao and Mr. Charanjeet Singh, Advocates for R-1, 2, 4 to 7, 9 to 11 with respondents. Mr. Sachin, Advocate for R-3 and R-8 Mr. Nikhil Majithia, Advocate for R-12

%

Date of Decision: 19th February, 2016

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

J U D G M E N T

MANMOHAN, J: (Oral)

1. Today, the petitioner who appears in person seeks an adjournment on the ground that he has not been able to engage a new lawyer.
2. On 12th February, 2016, this Court had reluctantly adjourned the matter at petitioner's request on the ground that he has to engage a new counsel. While adjourning the matter, this Court had clarified that no further adjournment would be granted on the next date of hearing on any pretext. Consequently, the prayer for adjournment is declined.

3. It is pertinent to mention that the petitioner seeks compensation of Rs. ten lakhs from the Delhi Police as well as respondent No. 12 for foisting alleged false cases of chain snatching.

4. In the opinion of this Court, just because the petitioner's brother has been acquitted in six to eight cases on the ground that charges have not been proved beyond reasonable doubt, compensation cannot be awarded. There is no finding in any case that the petitioner's brother was framed by the police officials or by any other respondent in a false case. In any event, as of today, at least two cases are still pending against the petitioner's brother.

5. Further, the petitioner has no locus standi to seek compensation on account of foisting of alleged false cases on his brother. Since the petitioner's brother is neither a minor nor under any disability, it is petitioner's brother who has the primary locus standi to file any proceeding for compensation.

6. Moreover, in view of the pleadings, this Court is of the view that disputed questions of fact arise for consideration.

7. In fact, this Court is of the opinion that the present writ petition has been filed primarily to coerce the police not to take any action against the petitioner's brother. Consequently, the present writ petition is dismissed.

MANMOHAN, J

FEBRUARY 19, 2016

rs