

\$~35

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

+ W.P.(C) 8496/2018

DR NIRMAL CHOPRA ..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr Naushad Ahmad Khan, ASC  
(Civil), GNCTD with Mr Zahid  
Hanief, Advocate.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**

% **14.08.2018**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

- “i) direct respondents no.1 and 2 to conclude complaint dt. 30.10.2017 pending against respondents no.3 and 4 within such reasonable time as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.
- ii) impose costs upon respondents no.3 and 4 for deliberately not complying with directions of Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P. and others* (2014) 2 SCC 1.”

2. On 10.07.2017, the petitioner filed a complaint under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 against Shri Yakesh Yadav, who is stated to be the owner and the principal share holder of Antriksh Realtech Pvt. Ltd. According to the petitioner, respondent nos.3 and 4 (who were the concerned officers) did not act with due despatch. It is alleged that after receiving the reply from the persons accused, they did not take any steps.

On 01.10.2017, a closure report was prepared, which was signed by respondent no.4.

3. The petitioner's grievance is that respondent nos.3 and 4 have deliberately violated the directions of the Supreme Court as issued in ***Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. & Others: (2014) 2 SCC 1***. The petitioner made a complaint in this regard on 30.10.2017. It is stated that pursuant to an application made under the Right to Information Act, 2005, the petitioner was informed that proceedings have been initiated against respondent nos.3 and 4 under Rule 6 of the CCS (CCA) Rules (hereafter 'the Rules'). The petitioner has now filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that the directions be issued for conclusion of the said proceedings within a reasonable time.

4. The matter relating to question whether any disciplinary proceedings are required to be pursued against respondent nos.3 and 4 as it is a matter between the concerned authorities and the concerned respondents. These are disciplinary proceedings and the same are required to be conducted in accordance with the Rules. There is no reason to believe that the disciplinary proceedings, if any, initiated against respondent no.3/4 shall not be concluded in accordance with the Rules. Thus, no orders are required to be passed in this petition.

5. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

**VIBHU BAKHRU, J**

**AUGUST 14, 2018/MK**