



\$~74

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 161/2025**
SH. JAGJEET SINGH & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. M.S Bammi with MR. Virendra
Yadav and Mr. Sumit Rana,
Advocates

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI
AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for the
State along with W/SI Purvi Ahlawat.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER
% **17.01.2025**

CRL.M.A. 1281/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 161/2025

3. The instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed on behalf of petitioners seeking following prayers:

“...A. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the Respondent No. 1 to 5 to protect right to life and liberty of petitioners which is at stake at the hands of respondents no.6 and 7; and/or

B. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ



directing respondents no. 1 to 5 to provide adequate security to petitioners, with immediate effect so that the respondents no.6 and 7 may be prevented to act upon arbitrarily in manner whatsoever to harm personal life and limbs of petitioners; and/or

C. Issue a writ of prohibition or any other appropriate writ directing respondent no. 1 to 5 to provide adequate security to petitioners, with immediate effect so that the respondent no. 6 and 7 may be prevented to not visit the house of the petitioners...”

4. It is stated that petitioner no. 4 and respondent no. 6, on 01.03.2024, had entered into a live-in relationship agreement and had started living together in the house of petitioners. Thereafter, on 14.05.2024, they had started living separately in rented premises which was funded by petitioner no. 4, even though the rent agreement was executed by respondent no. 6. The case set out by the petitioners is that the respondent no. 6 had approached petitioner no. 1, who is the brother of petitioner no. 4, for a friendly loan and had borrowed a sum of Rs. 1,60,000/- initially, on 02.07.2024. A loan agreement in this regard was also executed. It is stated that respondent no. 6 had again approached the petitioner no. 1 seeking more financial help and accordingly, he had paid a further sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- each on two different occasions. However, in August, 2024, when petitioner no. 1 had tried to contact respondent no. 6 for repayment of loan, she had started avoiding him and had also restrained petitioner no. 4 from leaving the house and from talking to other petitioners i.e. his family members. It is submitted that respondent no. 6 had then extended threats to petitioner no. 1 to implicate petitioner no. 1 to 3 in false criminal cases, in case he asked her to repay the loan. On 13.09.2024, the petitioner no. 4 had approached the



Deputy Commissioner of Police, West Delhi with a representation against the said actions of respondent no. 6. On 25.10.2024, the petitioner no. 1 had served a legal notice to respondent no. 6 for repayment of borrowed amount, as the cheques for repayment issued by respondent no. 6 had been dishonoured.

5. The petitioners allege that on 18.11.2024, the respondent no. 6 had come along with some police officials to threaten petitioner no. 1 to 3, and they had taken petitioner no. 1 along with them to PS Tilak Nagar, where he was tortured, beaten and humiliated by alleged police officials in order to pressurize him to forget about his money lent to respondent no. 6 and not to take any further legal action, or else, the petitioners would be implicated in false cases and sent behind bars.

6. At the outset, the learned APP for the State, assisted by the Investigating Officer (IO), states that the FIR bearing No. 0035/2025 already stands registered against the present accused persons for the offences punishable under Sections 376D/506/376(2)(n)/34 of IPC.

7. Considering the fact that the petitioners herein are seeking relief against the police officers who are investigating the present case, whereas an FIR stands registered against the accused persons which is being investigated, the learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the present petition since it has now come to their notice that the FIR stands registered against the accused persons.

8. In view of the above, the present petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.



9. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JANUARY 17, 2025/zp

Click here to check corrigendum, if any