

\$~64

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

+ W.P.(C) 6326/2017

MUTHUVEL PALANI M Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **25.07.2017**

CM No. 26190/2017

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is allowed.

W.P.(C) 6326/2017 and CM Nos. 26188-26189/2017

3. The petitioner has filed the petition, *inter alia*, praying that its complaint be placed before the National Human Rights Commission (hereafter 'the Commission').
4. The petitioner also seeks an order directing that an independent investigation be conducted by the Commission. In addition he has made further prayers for directing the Commission to intervene in the proceedings pending before the Family Court, Madurai.
5. The petitioner, who appears in person, submits that his complaint was

rejected by the Registrar of the Commission and was not placed before the Commission. He also claims that his complaint should be taken on an urgent basis as per the National Human Rights Commission (Procedure) Amendment Regulation, 1997.

6. It is seen that there are certain disputes between petitioner and his wife and they have separated. The petitioner has also made certain allegations that his wife is involved in illicit relations with various different persons. The petitioner also states that his wife has also filed a petition for annulment of their marriage before the Family Court, Madurai on the ground that the petitioner is a lunatic.

7. The petitioner apprehends that his life would be in danger in Tamil Nadu. It is seen that the petitioner's complaint was registered by the Commission as case no.1560/22/15/2017 and was considered by the Commission on 03.07.2017. Thereafter, the Commission had decided that the petitioner's complaint be transmitted to the Commissioner of Police, Madurai, Tamil Nadu and has also called for a report from the police authorities within four weeks. The Commission has also expressed that it is expected that the Commissioner of Police shall take steps to ensure the safety of the complainant (the petitioner) in case he visits Madurai, Tamil Nadu. The complaint has also been forwarded to the concerned authority in Tamil Nadu.

8. The petitioner's prayer that the Commission has not considered his complaint is, therefore, not justified. Merely because the Commissioner's order dated 03.07.2017 has been communicated by the Assistant Registrar

by his letter dated 05.07.2017 does not mean that the Commission has not considered the petitioner's complaint.

9. The petitioner's prayer for directing that the Commission intervene in the proceedings in the Family Court, Madurai cannot be granted as no interference by the Commission in judicial proceedings is warranted.

10. The question whether an independent enquiry needs to be conducted is solely within the discretion of the Commission and this court is not persuaded to issue any directions in this regard.

11. The petition and the applications are, accordingly, dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 25, 2017
RK