

32# \$~

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2392/2017**

GAJRAJ SINGH

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Prabhakar Srivastava,
Advocate.

versus

COMMISIONER OF POLICE & ORS

..... Respondents

Represented by: Ms. Richa Kapoor, Additional
Standing Counsel for State with
SI Shri Bhagwan, PS Neb
Sarai.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

05.02.2018

%

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner only urges that six times the petitioner has been attacked. When this court asked for the MLCs of the petitioner prepared on these alleged acts, learned counsel for the petitioner could neither show the MLC nor any medical documents to fortify his claim.
2. In response to the present petition a status report has been filed. As per the status report, the petitioner had earlier also filed writ petition being W.P. (Crl) No. 1495/2015 challenging the withdrawal of security provided to it by the Delhi Police. The said writ petition was disposed of vide order dated 20th August, 2015 noting that no good ground has been shown by the petitioner for interfering in the administrative decision. LPA No. 648/2015 and S.L.P. No. 9602/2015 against the order have also been dismissed by the **W.P.(CRL) 2392/2017**

Division Bench of this Court and the Supreme Court vide orders dated 23rd September, 2015 and 21st September, 2016 respectively. Thus this is the second petition by the petitioner for the same prayer.

3. A perusal of the record reveals that three FIRs were registered on the complaint of the petitioner. The petitioner is also a witness in FIR No. 536/2013 which is pending trial, besides a case being registered on the complaint of the petitioner at PS Ballabhgarh, Faridabad, Haryana. However, the petitioner is also involved in five criminal offences, three at PS Neb Sarai and one at PS Sarojini Nagar and one at PS Hissar, Haryana. The petitioner has since been involved in one more case being FIR No. 582/2017 under Sections 420/406 IPC registered at PS Gannaur, Sonipat, Haryana.

4. Considering that the petitioner has not placed any material on record warranting grant of security cover to the petitioner, this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the order of the competent authority to withdraw the security cover and not to continue providing the petitioner with the PSOs. As per the status report also contact numbers of the beat staff and the division staff have already been given to the petitioner, who can be contacted in case required.

5. Petition is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

FEBRUARY 05, 2018
‘vn’