

\$~20

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1092/2016**

SATENDER PRASAD YADAV

..... Petitioner

Through: **Mr.G.S. Sharma and Mr.R.N Sharma,**
Advocates.

versus

STATE (GNCT OF DELHI) & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: **Mr.R.S.Kundu, A.S.C. for the State**
with **Mr.Ankit Kr. Gulia and**
Mr.Vishesh Wadhwa, Advocates with
SIMehras Alam, PS Khajuri Khas,
Delhi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

19.04.2016

1. By way of this writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr.P.C., petitioner is seeking directions to the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to ensure his safety from the hands of respondent Nos. 3 to 8.
2. Notice to respondent Nos. 3 to 8 could not be issued as petitioner had not taken any steps for getting them served.
3. Status report has been filed by the State which is to the following effect:-

“During the inquiry into the matter, it reveals that statement of respondent 8, namely Vineet Bansal was recorded. In which he stated that father of respondent no. 7 and 8 namely Chandrika Prasad Bansal had kept the applicant Satender Prasad Yadav as a house

made. Since then, the complainant has been doing work as a house made and in 2008, he left the job. In 2011, he again came in Delhi and on the requesting of the applicant, a room i.e. H.No. B-201, Gali No. 3, Sadatapur Extn., Delhi was given to the applicant for settle his life. That time, relations between the applicant and father of respondent no. 7 & 8 are good. Thereafter, the applicant was shifted to another room i.e. first floor of H.No. B-201, Gali No. 3, Sadatapur Extn., Delhi. Bansa family wants to vacate the house from the possession of the applicant but he did not vacate the room. Thereafter, mother of respondent no. 7 & 8 namely Susheela Bansal filed a civil suit for vacate the room is still pending before the KKD Court. The applicant filed a counter case before labour Court for claiming wages. But the case was dismissed and not maintainable. The applicant has feared to vacate the room. So he tried to tussling the matter and wants to pressure upon the respondents after filing false cases. No-one is threatening to the applicant and no need to police protection to the applicant.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the apprehension of petitioner is genuine.
5. In view of the status report submitted today, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the State to provide necessary protection to the petitioner through SHO concerned, in case of apprehension of any threat to the petitioner from respondent Nos. 3 to 8. The State shall also ensure that mobile numbers of concerned SHO/Beat Constable are provided to the Petitioner to enable him to contact if necessity arises.
6. In view of the above no further direction is necessary in this writ petition and the same is disposed of accordingly.

Order *dasti*.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

APRIL 19, 2016

'hkaur'