

\$~10

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4025/2020 & CM APPLs. 14432-33/2020**

SHAAN MOHD

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raj Shekhar Rao, Ms. Aanchal Tikmani, Ms. Mishika Singh, Mr. Raghav Kacher, Ms. Sonal Sarda and Mr. Areeb Amanullah, Advocates.

versus

GNCTD & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Devesh Singh, Advocate for GNCTD.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

ORDER

%

30.07.2020

1. This hearing has been done by video conferencing.
2. The present petition was filed by the Petitioner who was a victim of the riots which took place in North-East Delhi in February, 2020. The Petitioner sought compensation in terms of the Delhi Government's Assistance Scheme for riot victims. The Petitioner had suffered a gun-shot injury but was not paid the compensation in view of the fact that the hospital had not certified his injury as a 'serious injury'. Notice was issued on 8th July, 2020 and thereafter, vide order dated 9th July, 2020 interim compensation of Rs.50,000/- was directed to be released.
3. Letter dated 21st July, 2020 has been filed on record issued by the SDM (Seelampur), who was in charge of disbursement of compensation. It

records that the certificate from the hospital has been obtained regarding the nature of injury and initially Rs.50,000/- was paid on 17th July, 2020 and thereafter, final payment of Rs.1,50,000/- has also been made. Thus, the entire compensation in terms of the scheme stands released to the Petitioner.

4. Mr. Rajshekhar Rao, Id. counsel submits that prayer (D) of the petition praying for medical assistance may be considered in view of the fact that the Petitioner has retained a bullet in his thigh and two operations will have to take place, one for removal of the bullet and one for removal of the iron rod. He also submits that similarly placed parties should be provided compensation in an expedited manner. On the other hand, Mr. Devesh Singh, Id. counsel submits that insofar as similarly placed parties are concerned, a general order ought not to be passed as this is not a PIL.

5. Considering the overall facts and circumstances, insofar as the Petitioner is concerned, he is permitted to make a representation to the concerned SDM for admission into a Government hospital so that the expenses for his further medical treatment can be curtailed. A decision on the same shall be taken by the concerned SDM within two weeks.

6. With these observations, the petition and all pending applications are disposed of. No further orders are called for.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

JULY 30, 2020

dj/T