



\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 710/2025**
PARAMJIT KAUR KLER & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Yash Punjabi, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, ASC with
Mr. Abhijeet Kumar and Ms. Amisha
Gupta, Advocates for State.
SI Sanjay Dahiya, P.S. Mehrauli.
SI Anirban Bhattacharya, Mr. Apoorv
Agarwal and Ms. Divya Verma,
Advocates for R-6.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
14.10.2025

%

1. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeks the following reliefs:

- “i. Pass an appropriate writ, order, or direction in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ, order, or direction to Respondents 1 and 2 to provide immediate police protection to the Petitioners and her family to prevent any further harm or threats from the accused persons.*
- ii. Pass an appropriate writ, order, or direction in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ, order, or direction directing a fair and transparent investigation in the FIR which the Petitioner No. 1 seeks to lodge on the basis of the complaint dated 10.02.2025*
- iii. Pass an appropriate writ, order, or direction in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ, order, or direction to Respondents 1 and 2 to conduct a departmental enquiry against the officials of*



Delhi Police being Respondents 4 to 5 for dereliction of duty and refusal to register an FIR, and conclude the enquiry in a time-bound manner.

- iv. *Direct the Respondents to file a Status Report before this Hon'ble Court within a stipulated time period regarding the action taken in the matter.*
- v. *Direct the removal of Respondent No. 5 as the Investigating officer and investigation by an independent/ impartial agency.*
- vi. *Pass such other or further orders as may be deemed fit and proper in the interest of justice."*

2. On 28th February, 2025, in an effort to facilitate an amicable resolution, the parties were referred to mediation. However, the said proceedings did not fructify.

3. Be that as it may, as regards prayer (i), directions have already been issued to the concerned SHO, P.S. Mehrauli, to provide necessary assistance to the Petitioners in the event any threat is reported. The SHO is also directed to conduct a threat perception analysis to take appropriate protective measures accordingly.

4. As regards prayer (ii), the same is misconceived. As on date, no FIR has been registered on the basis of the Petitioner's complaints. It is stated by counsel for the Petitioners that an application under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 has already been filed before the Magistrate, which is still pending adjudication. Hence, the prayer seeking directions for a "fair and transparent investigation" in an FIR that is yet to be registered is premature and does not warrant any direction at this stage. In case the Petitioners do succeed in such a prayer, it is needless to say, any investigation in the FIR has to be transparent and within the confines of law.

5. Prayer (iii) seeks mandamus to conduct a departmental inquiry against Respondents No. 4 & 5 for failure to record the Petitioners' information.



However, as noted above, the issue of registration of the FIR is presently pending before the Magistrate and therefore, this prayer cannot be entertained at this stage. Similarly, prayer (v), seeking removal of the Investigating Officer, is also premature.

6. In view of the above, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is clarified that the Court has not made any observations on the merits of the case.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2025/as