



\$~10

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 78/2022**

PRAVEEN DABAS THROUGH PAROKAR/ REAL BROTHER

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Saumya Bajaj, Mr. Arun Khatri,
Mr. Sahil, Mr. Akshay, Mr. Nishant and Ms.
Shreya, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Nandita Rao, ASC for State with
Insp. Robin Tyagi, PS: Crime Branch and SI
Nishant, PS: Special Cell.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **25.04.2024**

1. This writ petition has been filed by the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:

“a. Pass an order/direction or writ in nature of Mandamus or any other similar writ thereby directing strict adherence to the directions/guidelines issued by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in Paramvir Singh Saini Vs. Baljeet Singh & Ors. (SLP (Crl.) no. 3543/2020) to be practiced by IO in FIR no.218/2021, U/s 308/325/323/341/5061188/269/34 IPC & 25/54/59 Arms Act, Ps. Model Town, Delhi during police remand of the Petitioner till 14.01.2022.

b. Pass an order/direction or writ in nature of Mandamus or any other similar writ thereby issuing directions that non observance guidelines issued in Paramvir Singh Saini Vs. Baljeet Singh & Ors. (SLP (Crt.) no. 3543/2020) shall be construed as contempt of court.”

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner at the outset does not press prayer
(a) as the same is rendered infructuous, in view of the fact that Petitioner is



in judicial custody since January, 2022. She, however, presses prayer (b) of the petition and submits that there is wilful non-compliance of the guidelines issued by the Supreme Court in ***Paramvir Singh Saini v. Baljeet Singh & Ors., SLP (Crl.) No. 3543/2020***, decided on 02.12.2020.

3. Learned ASC for the State, on instructions, states that a requirement for 233 CCTV cameras was projected, out of which 213 CCTV cameras were procured through a detailed process of tendering and have been installed. Efforts are being made to requisition more cameras and as soon as they are received, they shall be installed. In this context, Ms. Rao, hands over copy of letter dated 04.04.2024 and urges that there is no wilful disobedience of the guidelines passed by the Supreme Court.

4. Having perused the letter dated 04.04.2024, this Court is of the view that steps have been taken by the State to procure and install the CCTV cameras and the process is on going. This Court is unable to come to a conclusion, at this stage, that there is disobedience of the directions passed by the Supreme Court. It is however hoped and expected that the process of procuring more CCTV cameras as per actual requirement shall be expedited.

5. Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JYOTI SINGH, J

APRIL 25, 2024/DU/shivam