

\$~6.

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

% *Decided on: 12th October, 2020*

+ **W.P.(C) 7795/2020**

GAURAV KUMAR BANSAL Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr.Vikas Mahajan, CGSC with
Mr.Jatin Puniyani, Adv. for UOI.

Mr.Anjum Javed, ASC for GNCTD.

Mr.Tushar Sannu, Advocate with Ms.Ankita
Bhadouriya, Advocate for Respondent No. 4/State
Mental Health Authority.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

JUDGMENT

: **D. N. Patel, Chief Justice (Oral)**

Proceedings in the matter have been conducted through video conferencing.

1. This public interest litigation has been preferred with the following prayers:-

“A. Issue Writ / Order / Direction in the nature of Mandamus against Respondents and in particular Respondent No. 02 and Respondent No. 04 to issue notification specifying the MINIMUM STANDARDS for different categories of MENTAL HEALTH ESTABLISHMENTS as provided under Section 65(6) of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017.

B. Issue a Writ/Order/Direction in the nature of mandamus against respondents and in particular Respondent No.1 to issue REGULATIONS with respect to manner of making

ADVANCE DIRECTIVES as provided under Section 06 of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017.

C. Pass any other Order or Direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances as mentioned above."

2. Having heard the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents, it appears that the grievances ventilated in this petition pertain to the provisions of Section 65(6) of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 (hereinafter, "the Act, 2017"). The petitioner is mainly seeking issuance of "**Minimum Standards for Different Categories of Mental Health Establishment**" as provided under Section 65(6) of the Act, 2017.

3. Learned Counsel appearing for the respondents submitted that the respondents have already prepared a draft in this regard which is at the final stage of approval, and the same will be published immediately once finalized.

4. In view of these facts, and keeping in mind the provisions of Section 65(6) of the Act, 2017, at this stage, we hereby direct the respondents to treat this writ petition as a representation and take necessary action in accordance with law, rules, regulations and Government policies applicable to the facts of the case as expeditiously as possible and practical.

5. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE

OCTOBER 12, 2020/ 'anb'

PRATEEK JALAN, J

W.P.(C) 7795/2020

Page 2 of 2