

\$~20

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

+ W.P.(C) 4876/2016

DR N PRADEEP SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

Versus

HIGH COURT OF DELHI THR ITS

REGISTRAR GENERAL

..... Respondent

Through: Mr.Varun Mishra, Adv. for

Mr.Rajeshkhar Rao, Adv.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT NATH**

**ORDER**

%

**25.05.2016**

1. This Public Interest petition has been filed by a practicing advocate with the following prayer:

"(a) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ order or direction to the Respondent to make a circular similar to that of Annexure-P I for protection of the judges of High Court of Delhi at New Delhi.

(b) Taking necessary steps/issuing directions to the concerned authorities not to entertain false and frivolous litigation/correspondence without any basis particularly against judicial officers and treating such correspondence as Ultra Vires, with all its consequences etc. particularly against the judges of this High Court in consonance with the Notification as mentioned in the title."

2. We have heard the petitioner who appeared in person. The circular filed in the writ petition as 'Annexure-P1' is dated 17.05.2016 which has

been issued by the respondent on the administrative side for the purpose of maintaining uniformity in procedure while dealing with the complaints received in the High Court against the members of the subordinate judiciary. We are unable to understand as to how a writ of mandamus has been sought to compel the respondent to issue a similar circular purportedly for the protection of Judges of High Court, without making out a case to establish that there is a failure on the part of the respondent to perform a statutory or public duty.

3. At any rate, the law is well settled that a writ petition by way of Public Interest Litigation can be maintained only for the purpose of enabling this court to look into the grievances complained on behalf of the people belonging to the disadvantaged category who cannot vindicate the legal wrong or legal injury caused to them for any violation of any constitutional or legal right. Since the petition is not intended for any such purpose, the same deserves no consideration by this court.

4. Hence, we decline to entertain the petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**JAYANT NATH, J**

**MAY 25, 2016**/pmc