

\$~58

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7806/2018**

DAMAN KRANTI AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr Lave Kumar Sharma, Mr Manish Gupta and Mr Sumit Birla, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Anjum Javed, ASC, GNCTD with Mr Devendra Kumar and Mr Faran Ahmed, Advocates with Mr Sanjay, Joint Assistant Director, R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

27.07.2018

CM No.29915/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 7806/2018 & CM No. 29948/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

“I. Issue a writ(s)/order(s)/direction(s) in the nature of mandamus against the respondents and set-aside the impugned order dated 13.08.2009 passed by the Respondent No.1.”

3. The petitioners are essentially, aggrieved by the communication dated 13.08.2009. A perusal of the said order indicates that it refers to the minutes

of the meeting, whereby it was decided that the complaints made by certain newspapers including the petitioner would not be considered. This decision was based on an allegation that the said newspapers have been regularly making complaints and using the same “for black mailing the government officials”. The view expressed in the said meeting was that such newspapers are making complaints not with the object of eradication of corruption but for other purposes.

4. The learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1 points out that the decision impugned herein was taken over 9 years ago and much water has flown under the bridge. He also accepts that since the respondent no.1 accepts complaints from public at large, it may not be apposite to ignore all the complaints made by certain parties without even examining the same.

5. In this view, it is directed that all complaints made by the petitioner as well as any other persons shall be treated equally. However, this would not preclude respondent no.2 from summarily rejecting the same if respondent no.1 is of the view that the complaint is not *bonafide* or genuine.

6. The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

7. It is also clarified that any complaint made by respondent no.2 against the petitioner with regard to defamation would be considered on its own merits uninfluenced by this order.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 27, 2018
MK