



\$~19

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 574/2025**
SH SANJAY GUPTAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Varun Jain, Advocate.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC (Crl.)
with Mr. Alok Sharma, Advocate.
SI Yogesh Sharma, P.S. Bharat
Nagar.
Mr. Ravi Ranjan, Advocate for R-5 &
6.
Mr. Ravi Ranjan and Mr. Siddhant
Yadav, Advocates.
Mr. Raj Kumar Yadav and Ms. Anjali
Ahlawat, Advocates for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

% **ORDER**
08.10.2025

1. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, read with Section 528 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeks directions to Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 to ensure the protection, safety, and security of the life and liberty of the Petitioner.
2. The Petitioner asserts ownership of the ground and second floors (along with roof rights) of property bearing No. D-4/3A, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi, on the basis of certain title documents. Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 are stated to be in possession of the first floor of the said property. The record



reflects that several civil proceedings between the parties concerning the same property are already pending before the competent courts.

3. The Petitioner alleges that Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 have been harassing him and pressuring him to purchase the first floor of the property for ₹5,00,00,000/-. He claims to have filed multiple complaints in 2022 alleging threats, extortion, and intimidation by the said respondents, including the deployment of anti-social elements to coerce him. It is stated that representations were made to the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Commissioner of Police, the Deputy Commissioner of Police (North-West District), and the Station House Officer, P.S. Bharat Nagar, but no effective action followed. On this basis, the Petitioner seeks the following relief: -

“1. Pass a writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus in favour of the petitioner and against the respondents No. 1 to 4 thereby directing the respondents No. 1 to 4 to grant the protection, safety and security to the precious life of the petitioner.”

4. The Court has carefully considered the submissions and material on record. It is apparent that the dispute between the Petitioner and Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 is essentially civil in nature, arising from issues of possession and ownership of immovable property. Multiple civil suits between the parties are already pending adjudication.

5. Instead of pursuing remedies before the appropriate civil forums, the Petitioner has sought to invoke the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court to convert a private property dispute into one of alleged criminal intimidation. The criminal law machinery of the State cannot be permitted to be used as an instrument for settling private civil scores. Petitions of this kind, which attempt to confer a criminal colour upon civil disputes, deserve to be firmly discouraged.



6. It is also noted that the complaints relied upon by the Petitioner date back to 2022. Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC for the State, submits that the police authorities conducted a threat assessment pursuant to those complaints, and no credible threat to the Petitioner's life or safety was found. It further emerges that the Petitioner is not residing at the subject premises but at another address in the same locality.

7. In view of the foregoing, the Court finds no merit in the present petition. It is evidently an attempt to misuse the process of law and to employ the State machinery for the resolution of a private dispute. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed with costs of ₹25,000/-, to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund, within four weeks from today.

8. Disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 8, 2025

as