



\$~26

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1037/2025**

JAGRITI MEHRA AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Parth Chaturvedi, Advocate for
Petitioners along with Petitioners in
person.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCTD OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents

Through: Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, ASC for
the State along with Mr. Abhijeet
Kumar, Advocate and SI Shyam
Nandan, PS Bindapur.

Mr. Neeraj Kardam, Mr. V Madhukar
and Ms. Karuna Sharma, Advocates
for Respondents No. 2 and 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

15.09.2025

%

1. The Petitioners are sisters and are related to Respondent No. 2, who is their brother. Respondent No. 3 is the sister-in-law of the Petitioners. The Petitioners, as well as Respondent No. 2, reside on different floors of the property situated at WZ-33, Opposite Nirankari Gurudwara, Dayalsar Colony, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi-110059.
2. Apprehending threats to their life and liberty, the Petitioners submitted a complaint dated 28th June, 2024, to the SHO, P.S. Bindapur, New Delhi, followed by another complaint to the DCP, Dwarka, New Delhi, on 11th February, 2025.



3. Alleging that no action was taken on the said complaints, the Petitioners approached this Court by filing the present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following relief:

“a. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction to respondent no. 4 to 7 directing them to provide adequate protection to the life, limbs and property of the petitioners and their children from the illegal acts of the respondents no.2 and 3”

4. On 2nd April, 2025, after considering the submissions of the Petitioners, and while issuing notice to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, the Court passed the following order:

“2. Petitioners seek directions to the police authorities (respondents no. 4–7) for protection against certain alleged acts of respondents no. 2 and 3, who are brother and sister-in-law of petitioners.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents no. 4–7 accepts notice. Status Report be filed within two weeks. The concerned DCP shall carry out a detailed exercise of Threat Perception Analysis and submit the report within two weeks.

4. Notice to respondents no. 2 and 3 also be issued returnable on 08.05.2025.

5. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that earlier, mother of the petitioners during her lifetime was constrained to seek similar police protection and was granted relief. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also shown me the photographs of petitioners reflecting injuries suffered by them. From the concerned police station, Inspector Bijender and SI Shyam Nandan have appeared and they submit that there is partition dispute between the parties. SHO Bindapur is directed to ensure no harm is caused to the petitioners and/or their children till further orders. In order to ensure compliance, copy of this order be also sent to the concerned ACP.”

5. In compliance with the above directions, the State filed a status report dated 6th May, 2025, which states as under:

“5.1. It is submitted that the Petitioner/Applicant Jagriti Mehra D/o Lt. Sh. PK Bussi R/o WZ-33, Opposite Nirankari Gurudwara, Dayalsar Road, Dayalsar Colony, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi along with her sister Meetu Bussi D/o Late Sh. PK Bussi has filed the present writ petition seeking adequate protection to the life, limbs and



property of the Petitioners and her children from the Respondent No. 2 and 3.

5.2. It is submitted that the Respondent No. 2 i.e. Sh. Bharat Bussi is the brother and Respondent No. 3 i.e. Smt. Kamini Bussi is the sister-in-law of the Petitioners herein. It is pertinent to mention that earlier mother of the Petitioner was having police protection as there is property partition dispute between both the parties.

5.3. On 2nd February, 2025 Meetu Bussi had made an PCR Call vide DD No. 51A in which she stated that her Sister-in-law (Bhabhi) Kamini Bussi went to the roof and start selling the old wooden doors and windows to the scrap dealer without her consent and when the complainant objected to the same then her sister-in-law started to quarrel with her and altercation took place and complainant sustained minor injuries. The investigating officer has taken up the matter seriously and a preventive action in U/s 126/169 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 was taken to normalise the public tranquillity and to avoid any wrongful net.

5.4. On 16th February, 2025, Petitioner No. 2/ Meetu Bussi had visited the police station and provided a written statement regarding the incident i.e. PCR Call vide DD No. 51A on 2nd February, 2025. Earlier an action under Section 126/169 BNSS was already taken in this regard on 2nd February, 2025 and as per the provided written statement an NCR vide NCR No. 08/2025, dated 16th February, 2025 under Section 324(4) and 351(4) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 was also registered in PS Bindapur, Dwarka.

5.5. That both the parties are family members and are brother and sister-in-law on one side and sisters and their children on the other side. Both parties have history of lights over property including the house that they all reside in share in common. Both parties have history of Kalandra proceedings twice earlier, first dated 08th October, 2023 and the second dated 2nd February, 2025 with respect to the same dwelling house.

5.6. That a discreet inquiry was carried out by the undersigned and local inputs were also taken from police station Bindapur and there is no threat to life of the Petitioners. However, regular visits and strict vigil is being kept to avoid any further harm to the Petitioners. The numbers of the beat constable and SHO have already been provided to the Petitioners."

6. Counsel for the Petitioners contends that no action has been taken on the complaints mentioned above. Counsel for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, on



the other hand, supports the status report filed by the State, asserting that it contains the correct narration of the facts, as they exist today.

7. As per the status report, there is ongoing dispute between the Petitioners and Respondent No. 3 pertaining to the property where all of them are residing. The State has also highlights the history of *Kalandra* proceedings between the parties.

8. Based on a threat perception analysis, the State has come to a conclusion that there is no existing threat to the Petitioners' life that warrants special arrangements to be made by the State.

9. In light of the above, the Court finds no reason to pass any orders in the present petition and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

10. However, in the event, any of the parties receive any threat, they are at liberty to approach the concerned SHO, who shall duly diarize the complaint, conduct an inquiry, and, if so warranted, take appropriate action in accordance with law.

11. As regards the Petitioners' grievance that no action was taken on their previous complaints, they are at liberty to avail the remedy provided under the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, by approaching the concerned Judicial Magistrate under Section 175(3) of BNSS [corresponding to Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973].

12. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 15, 2025/MK