

\$~31

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 1276/2017 & CrI.M.A. 7083/2017

JAGDISH MINOCHA

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Pramod Kr. Singhal, Mr.  
Rahul Singhal, Advs.

versus

STATE & ORS

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Avi Singh, ASC with Mr.  
Shashank Vachher, Adv. with  
SI Ramesh Kumar PS Chandni  
Mahal.  
Mr. S.L. Gupta, Mr. Mithilesh  
Pal, Advs. for R-4 to 6.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA**

**ORDER**

**28.02.2018**

%

By this petition the petitioner has sought protection from respondents No.4 to 6 who are his sons.

Petitioner is present in Court. This Court has heard the petitioner in person at length. Petitioner states that he owns flat No.115, Minocha Apartment, H Block, Vikas Puri, New Delhi. In the year 1985 when he purchased the said flat and wanted to shift there, petitioner's wife did not want to live with the mother of the petitioner, thus since then petitioner's wife and children were living in the said flat whereas the petitioner with his mother shifted to other place on rent.

***W.P.(CRL) 1276/2017***

***page 1 of 3***

Petitioner states that he has been residing separately from his wife and children for the last about 30 years. Petitioner further states that he has no objection if his wife and the elder son who is presently living at 115, Minocha Appartments continue to live there whereas other sons are living in the other places nearby; but he does not want his sons to interfere in his peaceful life.

Petitioner states that he has a factory at Maya Puri which he has given on rent and from the said rent, the petitioner besides running his expenditure also gives a share to his wife and some monthly help to even respondent No.6/ Lenin Minocha, his son who is a struggling Advocate and has not settled in life. His apprehension is that in case he has to sell the factory at Maya Puri he would not be in a position to run his own expenses as he is living in a rented accommodation and also bears the expenses of his wife and one son.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.4, 5 & 6, the three sons of the petitioner fairly states that at one point of time even if the respondent No.4 and 5 had expressed the desire to sell the Maya Puri factory as they were in debts, none of the three sons i.e. respondents No.4, 5 and 6 now want the petitioner to sell the said property. They have no objection to the manner in which their father deals with the said property. Thus, apparently at this stage the apprehension of the petitioner are unfounded.

However, considering the fact that the petitioner is living alone at the age of 82 years and is a senior citizen to whom protection is required to be provided by the State as per its policy decision, State is directed to ensure the protection of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is presently residing at Property No. 9620, Arya Nagar, Bagh Raoji, Manak Pura, Kishan Ganj, Delhi. Learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State fairly states that he will intimate to the SHO PS Desh Bandhu Gupta Road to register the petitioner as a senior citizen and provide adequate protection as per the policy for providing protection to senior citizens who are residing alone.

In view of the statement of learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State, petition and application are disposed of.

**MUKTA GUPTA, J.**

**FEBRUARY 28, 2018**  
**‘ga’**