

\$~1.

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 1997/2016

PRADEEP KUMAR SHUKLA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Binay K Das and Priyanka Das,
Advocates

versus

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

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu, Adv for Mr. Rahul
Mehra, Standing Counsel for State
with SI Shri Bhagwan, PS Neb Sarai
Mr. D.K. Singh, Adv for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER

02.01.2017

%

The petitioner has preferred the present writ petition to seek a direction to respondent no.1 i.e. Delhi Police to provide protection to him, his wife and minor child from respondent no.2 and his associates. Respondent no.2 has filed his reply to the writ petition.

Respondent no.2 points out that the petitioner owes a certain amount to respondent no.2. On account of the complaint being filed by the petitioner, respondent no.2 was also apprehended. Counsel for respondent no.2 submits that the disputes between the parties are pending in court and

shall take its due course. However, counsel for respondent no.2, on instructions, states that respondent no.2 shall not take the law into his own hands and whatever grievances may be there, the same shall be resolved only through legal means. The said assurance given by counsel for respondent no.2 shall bind respondent no.2.

The SHO concerned shall also counsel respondent no.2 in this regard so that he does not take the law into his own hands. However, in case the petitioner still has any reasonable cause for apprehension of any threat or harm from respondent no.2, he may approach the SHO, PS Neb Sarai, who shall examine and provide protection to the petitioner after making an assessment of the threat perceived by him.

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Dasti.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

JANUARY 02, 2017

sr