

39# \$~

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 2113/2018 and Crl. M.A. No.12765/2018 (protection)

KOSAR ALI & ANR

..... Petitioners

Represented by: Mr. Javed Ahmad, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Represented by: Mr. Rajesh Mahajan,
Additional Standing Counsel
for State with SI Amit Kumar,
PS Karawal Nagar,
Mr. M.L. Yadav and Mr.
Narsingh Narain Rai,
Advocates for respondent No.7.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

09.08.2018

%

1. By this petition, petitioners seek protection from respondent Nos. 4 to 8. As per the complaint submitted by the petitioner No.1 to SHO, PS Karawal Nagar, Delhi, petitioner No.1 stated that he was a property dealer and Naeem used to refer clients to him and every time petitioner No.1 gave money to Naeem from the profit he earned. However, the last assignment with Naeem was in May, 2017 whereafter there was no business. It is alleged that Naeem along with his brother Amjad and Arsad, when the business of the petitioner No.1 was growing, started having ill eye on his work and the three of them in collusion with Ambrish Rawat demanded a payment of ₹14 crores from the petitioner No.1.

W.P.(CRL) 2113/2018

Page 1 of 2

2. It is stated that the four of them visited the office of the petitioner No.1 and extended threats of arranging killers to kill the petitioner No.1 if the payment of ₹14 crores was not given. The petitioner No.1 was also threatened his son would be implicated in false cases of rape.
3. In the complaint neither any time nor date when the alleged incident took place has been mentioned. The complaint is totally vague in nature.
4. Be that as it may, this Court called for a status report from the State and as per the status report the dispute between the parties is civil in nature and there are monetary transactions between the petitioner and the private respondents. The threat assessment was also done and it was found that no security was required to the petitioners.
5. Considering the vague allegations in the complaint as also the status report this Court finds no merit in the present petition.
6. Petition and application are dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

AUGUST 09, 2018
‘vn’