

\$~3

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

%

Date of Decision: 22nd July, 2016

+ **W.P. (C) 6199/2015**

AMIT SAHNI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sahni, petitioner-in-person.

Versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE & ANRRespondent

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Sr. Adv. With
Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC for
GNCTD.
Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

CM No. 1617/2016 (delay in refiling)

In the facts and circumstances explained in the application delay in refiling the restoration application is condoned.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No. 1616/2016 (for restoration)

For the reasons stated in the application, we recall the earlier order dated 14.10.2015 and the writ petition is restored to its original number.

CM stands disposed of.

W.P. (C) 6199/2015

1. The present Public Interest Litigation has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking directions to the Commissioner of Police

to take steps for replacement of archaic and difficult words and phrases of Persian and Urdu with simple words of Hindi and English for official use by Delhi Police.

2. It is pleaded in the writ petition that Delhi Police uses archaic Urdu and Persian words in their police reports, challan, etc. which is difficult for a common man to understand. It is also pleaded that it is cumbersome for the police officials also to learn such words in order to understand the proceedings of police.

3. Mr. Amit Sahni, the petitioner appearing in person, therefore, submits that it is necessary in the interest of justice to issue directions as prayed for.

4. On the other hand, it is submitted by Shri Gautam Narayan, ASC appearing on behalf of Commissioner of Police, Govt. of NCT of Delhi that the issue raised in this petition is covered by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Uttar Pradesh Hindi Sahitya Sammelan vs. State of Uttar Pradesh (2014) 9 SCC 716*. It is also submitted by him that though it is a fact that certain words of Urdu/Persian are used by Delhi Police in the proceedings, the plea of the petitioner that the police officials, accused, legal practitioners and the judicial officers are finding it difficult to understand is without any basis and no such complaint has been received from any quarter.

5. It is brought to our notice by the petitioner as well as the learned counsel for the respondents that training is imparted to police officers for learning such Urdu/Persian words and the same is part of their course/training. In fact, the petitioner himself pleaded that such training is being imparted to police at Police Training College and Jharoda Kalan, New Delhi.

6. Be that as it may, in the light of the facts and circumstances noticed, it appears to us that the grievance sought to be highlighted by the petitioner may be of an individual or group of individuals, however, it cannot be termed as infraction of any right of public at large.

7. Therefore, the matter does not deserve to be entertained as a Public Interest Litigation.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

CHIEF JUSTICE

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J.

22nd JULY, 2016

