

\$~

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

+ W.P.(C) 6493/2016

KAPIL KAKAR

.....Petitioner

Through : Mr. Sanjeev Sagar, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

....Respondents

Through : Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with Mr. Anil Dabas, Advocates for UOI.

Mr. Rahul Mehra, Sr. Standing Counsel with Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC for R-2 & 3.

Mr. Samjeev Sabharwal, Advocate for DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

ORDER

27.07.2016

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed as a Public Interest Litigation by the petitioner, who is stated to be a psychologist and a social activist for the benefit of Delhi Police seeking police reforms and to increase the number of police officers, better pay, reduction in working hours, regular training, better recruitment process and effective scientific equipment for crime investigation.
2. It is pleaded in the writ petition that the work output given by the officers is directly related to the conditions of employment of the police officers. They are overburdened with work due to rising crime and made to work for long hours on a very low salary which in turn results in poor crime control and inefficient crime investigation. It is contended that the sad state of affairs affects the public at large. It is also contended that Delhi is always on high terror alert and there are

huge number of complaints/FIRs registered by the police and the current number of police officers working under such unfavourable conditions shall not be able to handle them. The further contention is that there is a huge backlog of cases and the inability of police officers to meet the demands has made the people to suffer greatly.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner, while reiterating the pleadings, contended that the long working hours, no holidays, low salaries and insufficient number of police personnel has led to extreme frustration, exhaustion and corruption amongst the police officers and therefore appropriate directions are necessary for police reforms.

4. We have also heard the learned counsels who appeared for the respondents on advance notice.

5. In our considered opinion, the issue needs consideration, in the first instance, by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Union of India as well as the Government of NCT of Delhi. Accordingly, we dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the respondents No. 1 to 3 to look into the issues raised by the Petitioner by treating this writ petition as a representation and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law. Such order shall be communicated to the petitioner and the petitioner is at liberty to file a fresh writ petition in case necessity thereof arises.

6. The present writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

CHIEF JUSTICE

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J

JULY 27, 2016

gr