

\$~1

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1356/2018**

GULBEG ALI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Adit S. Pujari and Ms. Tusharika
Mattoo, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rahul Mehra, standing counsel
along with Mr. Chaitanya Gosain,
Adv. along with SI Raghvendra and
ASI Prahlad Singh AHTU/NE Delhi.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE VINOD GOEL

ORDER

%

06.09.2018

1. This is the second round of litigation brought before this Court by the Petitioner seeking directions regarding his daughter Rubina Fatima and her husband Ali Hassan. The Petitioner had filed a complaint on 1st November 2016 about his daughter having gone missing since 2013.

2. Earlier this Court had by an order dated 20th January 2017 in Writ Petition (Crl) 3106/2016 transferred the inquiry into the Petitioner's complaint to the District Investigation Unit (DIU) North East, Delhi. Subsequently, by order dated 11th October, 2017 this Court disposed of the above writ petition by issuing the following directions:

(i) The State would continue to take serious steps to trace the missing

person.

- (ii) The petitioner would be informed of the progress of the matter ever six weeks, which shall be the responsibility of the Investigating Officer.
- (iii) The State would again re-examine as to whether the husband of the missing person is fit for polygraphy test.

3. Unhappy with the progress of the inquiry by the DIU, the present writ petition was filed by the Petitioner on 27th April 2018. Three status reports have been filed in the present writ petition. The latest one is the status report dated 4th September, 2018 filed by the Assistant Commissioner of Police (ACP), DIU, NE District, Delhi. It details the steps taken since the previous hearing on 10th July 2018, for tracing out the missing couple. Local inquiries have been undertaken at villages in Bulandshahar and Muzzafarnagar in Uttar Pradesh, but no information has been able to be gathered till now. The list of persons whom the police spoke to have been set out in para 22 of the status report. It is stated that ZIPNET was regularly checked during this period but no clue could be found.

4. Mr. Rahul Mehra, learned Standing counsel, assures the court that the continuous efforts will be made and the Petitioner will be kept posted in writing at least once in every four weeks about the progress of the inquiry.

5. The Court sees no purpose at this stage in keeping this petition pending. If the petitioner has any leads he should share them with the ACP concerned.

6. The petition is disposed of.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

VINOD GOEL, J.

SEPTEMBER 06, 2018

“sandeep”