

\$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**+ **CONT.CAS(C) 844/2015****J K MITTAL**

Through

..... Petitioner

Mr. J.K. Mittal with Mr. Rajveer
Singh, Advocates

versus

B S BASSI & ORS

Through

..... Respondents

Mr. Naushad Ahmed Khan, ASC with
Mr. Tarique Yazdani, Advocate for
Delhi Police with Mr. B.S. Gujjar,
DCP/East, Mr. Sanjeev Gupta,
ACP/Preet Vihar, Mr. Hari Singh,
SHO/Sharkpur and SI Yogesh, PS
Shakarpur.Mr. Ajay Verma, Sr. Standing
Counsel with Mr. Dhanesh Relan,
Standing Counsel, Mr. Vaibhav
Mishra and Ms. Kirti Parmar,
Advocates for DDA.

%

Date of Decision: 7th January, 2016**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN****J U D G M E N T****MANMOHAN, J: (Oral)**

1. By the orders dated 9th December, 2014 and 9th September, 2015 the police was directed to carry out assessment of petitioner's threat perception and pass a speaking order. The said order was directed to be served upon

the petitioner. If the assessment disclosed that petitioner was entitled to any protection, the same was to be provided

2. In the status report dated 26th November, 2015 it is stated that threat assessment was carried out by Special Cell, Delhi Police and report has been supplied to petitioner.

3. Petitioner who appears in person states that no speaking order has been furnished to him. He states though he had asked for the same by way of an application under the RTI Act, the same has been denied on the ground that it is protected by Section 8(1)(g) of the said Act.

4. Petitioner also states that the Delhi Police has launched a vilification campaign against him.

5. This Court has perused the paper book and finds that the threat assessment report dated 3rd November, 2015 has been placed on record. A reading of the said document reveals that it is a speaking order.

6. However, at this stage, as the petitioner states that he is aggrieved by the said order, he is given liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law. Rights and contentions of all parties including with regard to maintainability of such a petition is left open.

7. With the aforesaid observations, present contempt petition is closed and notices issued are discharged.

MANMOHAN, J

JANUARY 07, 2016

rn