$~1

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

\+ W.P.(CRL) 3949/2018

RAGHUBIR SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kartickay Mathur and Mr. Sanket Gupta, Advocates.

versus

STATE & ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Mehra, SC (Crl.) with Inspector Jitender Kumar, SI Hemant Kumar and ASI Heera Lal PS Nihal Vihar.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD GOEL

O R D E R

% 12.03.2019

1. A fresh Status Report has been filed by the SHO, P.S. Nihal Vihar stating *inter alia* that the neighbours of the petitioner's son-in-law, one Bhagchand and Rani, residents of Shiv Park, Nangloi, were interrogated and both of them have stated the same thing that the petitioner's daughter, Surender Kaur (wife of Puran) is mentally challenged and she had left her matrimonial house, where her husband and son are still residing, about 5-6 years ago and that her father, the petitioner herein, had never visited them to know about her whereabouts. It has further been stated that the IO had met Puran, his mother (mother-in-law of Surender Kaur), who is mentally disabled, and his minor son, aged about 5-6 years, who are residing together at Shiv Park, Nangloi.

2. Mr. Mehra, learned Standing Counsel (Crl.) states that Puran is deaf and dumb and had met with an accident 2-3 months ago, due to which he lost his vision from one eye. He submits that Puran's brother is taking care of the day-to-day needs of Puran and his son.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states on instructions that the police has not taken any steps to effectively interrogate Parvati to whom the petitioner had lent a sum of Rs.4.5 lakhs, in the year 2013.

4. We may note that in an earlier Status Report dated 21.12.2018, it was stated that Parvati and Raju (brother-in-law of the petitioner) had been interrogated and both of them had denied any information about Surender Kaur. In fact, Parvati had stated that the petitioner kept on harassing her after her husband's demise and used to visit her house in a drunken state but she had refused to meet him.

5. In our opinion, it is not natural for a father to be so unconcerned about the whereabouts of his daughter for almost five years. The petitioner admits in para 7 of the writ petition that after the year 2013, he did not meet his daughter but he does not explain the reason for not reaching out to her even on festive occasion in the past five years. It is deemed appropriate to direct the State to interrogate the petitioner as well to gather clues about the whereabouts of his daughter, who has been missing for the past five years. A fresh Status Report shall be filed well before the next date.

6. List on 10.4.2019.

HIMA KOHLI, J

VINOD GOEL, J

MARCH 12, 2019
ap/rkb