

\$~10

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 2613/2015

KRISHNA DEVI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Sushil Kumar Jain, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (GNCT GOVT OF DELHI) & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Rahul Mehra, Standing Counsel
for the State with Mr.Amrit Singh,
Mr.Jamal Akhtar, Advocates and ASI
Suresh Pal, PS Shalimar Bagh.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

12.01.2016

1. The petitioner Krishna Devi has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus thereby directing the State/police to provide protection to the petitioner, her husband and their handicapped daughter and further directing the respondents No.3 to 5 to allow the petitioner to live in her house No.C-1/37, Sector-16, Rohini, Delhi, not to harass the petitioner, her husband and their handicapped daughter, and to allow them to run their business in Shop No.3, Gali No.9, Mahabir Shoes, Main Road, Haider Pur, Ambedkar Nagar, Delhi.

2. Status report has been filed by the State.

W.P.(CRL) 2613/2015

Page 1 of 3

3. Heard.

4. In the status report filed by the State, it is specifically mentioned as under:-

'It is further submitted that the petitioner has another shop at Shop No.3, Gali No.9, Ambedkar Nagar, Haider Pur, Delhi on which the petitioner's son Yogesh Jain and her husband had been running a shoe shop for the last two years and now, only the petitioner's son is running the said shop and the shop is in the possession of Yogesh Jain. In view of the dispute, the phone numbers of the SHO, Additional SHO, ATO Shalimar Bagh and Beat Officers have been provided to the petitioner whom she can contact in case of emergency. The Beat staff has also been briefed to keep vigil and increase patrol frequency in the vicinity. The petitioner has also been briefed to approach the undersigned in case of any emergency and prompt police action will be taken accordingly. In view of the facts narrated above the undersigned is willing to abide by any direction which this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to pass.'

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that basically the dispute is with the respondents No.3 to 5, who are sons of the petitioner and the petitioner is not having any grievance against the police officials. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is satisfied with the protection assured in the status report filed by the State.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the above assurance given by the State in the status report, which is extracted above, he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the complaint filed by daughter of the petitioner against ASI Suresh Pal, PS Shalimar Bagh, Delhi to the DCP (Vigilance) shall also be withdrawn by her as they have no grievance against the police.

6. In view of the submissions made above by learned counsel for the petitioner, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

As prayed, copy of the order be given dasti to learned counsel for the parties.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JANUARY 12, 2016/‘st’