

\$~40

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1818/2016**

MONIKA THAKUR & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr Amit Kumar, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (N.C.T OF DELHI) & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Ashish Aggarwal, Addl. Standing
Counsel (Crl.).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SIDDHARTH MRIDUL

ORDER

%

02.06.2016

The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, prays as follows:-

- “i) Issue appropriate writ/instructions/directions to the respondent no.1 & 2 to protect and secure the life and property of the petitioners, thereby providing sufficient police protection to the petitioners.
- ii) Issue appropriate/instructions to the respondent no.3, whereby restraining him and his other associates/friends/relatives etc. from taking any heinous, illegal, unlawful, arbitrary and harassment to the petitioners.
- iii) Pass any other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.”

Mr Amit Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, limits the relief in the present petition to prayer clause (i).

Notice.

Mr Ashish Aggarwal, learned Addl. Standing Counsel (Crl.) appearing on advance notice, on instructions from the IO, namely, SI Naresh Kumar, Police

Station- Shahbad Dairy, states that in view of the circumstance that the petitioners are a newly-wed couple, who are apprehending grave threats at the hands of the father of the petitioner No.1, the police shall afford adequate protection to them after assessing the threat perception. The beat constable of the concerned area shall be sensitized in this behalf. The telephone number of the beat constable as well as the SHO of the concerned police station shall be provided to the petitioners so as to enable them to contact the former in the event of any threat or apprehension.

Directed accordingly.

In view of the direction that is being issued in the present petition, in my view, it is neither considered proper nor necessary to issue notice to respondent No.3, the father the petitioner No.1, particularly since no direction is being issued against him.

With the above directions the writ petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

Dasti.

SIDDHARTH MRIDUL, J

JUNE 02, 2016

mk