

\$~11

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3343/2017**

RITIKA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Sunil Nair, Advocate

versus

STATE (NCRT) OF DELHI) & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Kamna Vohra, ASC for the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

28.11.2017

CRL.M.A.19641/2017

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

W.P.(CRL) 3343/2017

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. with the following prayer:

a. To issue/writ/order or direction in the nature of mandamus as per facts and circumstances detailed above said in order to confirm a proper investigation in FIR No.565/2015, U/s 326/342/376D/506/120B of IPC registered at PS Mundaka, which is now under investigation by Crime Branch Respondent No.3 herein and also praying thereby to pass needful orders directions so as to complete basic recoveries of the articles involved and used in the crime in view of order dated 01.11.2017 pronounced by this Hon'ble Court in WP (CRL.) No.3283/2017.

b. To issue/writ/order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding Respondents thereby to appoint and entrust the case above said to a senior and competent officer for to conduct further investigation in the matter in order to comply the directions stipulated in order dated 11.01.2017 of this Hon'ble Court passed in W.P.(CRL.) No.3283/2016.

c. To issue, writ/order/direction thereby command the investigation agencies for to conduct the preliminary investigation thereby seize the mobile and video camera used by the Accused during the crime and thereby take all the appropriate steps to complete investigation without any further delay.

2. The petitioner earlier filed the writ petition bearing W.P.(CRL.) No.3283/2016 wherein this Court directed the investigation of this case to be conducted by the Crime Branch of Delhi Police. The concerned DCP was also directed to entrust the case to a senior and competent officer for conduct of further investigation in the matter.

3. It appears that the petitioner/complainant still remained dissatisfied with the investigation being conducted by the senior officer of Crime Branch and by filing this petition in fact, she is expecting this Court to monitor/guide the investigation, which is neither permissible nor warranted.

4. The writ petition is dismissed.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

NOVEMBER 28, 2017

'hkaaur'