

\$~36

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% Judgment delivered on: 25.04.2017

+ W.P.(C) 12078/2016

SUSHREE SWARUPA TRIPATHY

..... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ashok Gurnani, Adv..

For the Respondents : Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Adv. for R-1
Mr. Bhuvnesh Satija, Adv. for R-2 and 3
Mr. Raghav Awasthi, Adv. for R-4
Mr. Jaideep Singh and Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, Adv. for R-5

CORAM:-
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner by the present petition, inter-alia, seeks a direction to respondent no. 2 to investigate and adjudicate upon the complaint dated 25.05.2016 filed by the petitioner under the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 and also to investigate into the issuance of the certificate of analysis annexed to P-19, P-21, P-23, P-27 and P-29 and to withdraw the same if incorrectly issued. The petitioner further seeks a direction to respondent no. 2 and 3 to prevent the Respondent No.4 from interfering with the working of the petitioner with the Respondent No.3.

2. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2 and 3 submits that respondent no. 4 has since retired and as such there is no question of respondent no. 4 interfering with the working of the petitioner with respondent

no. 3 organization.

3. He further submits that the complaint dated 25.05.2016, filed by the petitioner, in so far as it related to sexual harassment, has been referred to the Internal Complaints Committee and is pending consideration and the part with regard to impugned certificates have been referred to a Fact Finding Committee and on the report being submitted, action, if warranted, would be taken.

4. In view of the above submissions of respondent no. 2 and 3, no further directions are recalled in respect of prayers i) and ii) wherein the petitioner has only sought directions to respondent no. 2 to investigate and adjudicate the complaints filed by the petitioner.

5. In so far as prayer with regard to interference by respondent no. 4 is concerned, since, respondent no. 4 has retired prayer iii) also does not survive.

6. In view of the above no order are required to be passed. The petition is disposed of.

7. It is needless to state in case the petitioner is aggrieved by any finding on the complaint dated 25.05.2016 made by the petitioner, the petitioner would be at liberty to take such remedies as may be available in accordance with law.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

APRIL 25, 2017
'rs'