



\$~19

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2118/2023**

GEETA ANAND

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Geeta Luthra, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Aadarsh Kothari and
Ms. Sprima Jha, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF DNCT

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, ASC for
State with Mr. Abhijeet Kumar and
Ms. Amisha Gupta, Advocates.
Mr. Sanjay Sharma, Insp, PS-Defence
Colony.
Mr. Nirankar Nagar, SI, PS-Defence
Colony.
Ms. Sonam Solanki, SI, PS-Saket.
Mr. Ramphal, SI, PS-Malviya Nagar.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

ORDER

10.09.2025

%

1. The present petition seeks the following reliefs:

- “a) To issue a writ in the nature of mandamus thereby directing Respondent No. 1 to 4. to take appropriate steps for protection of the Petitioner from the Respondent No.5*
- b) To issue a writ, order or direction thereby directing the respondent nos. 1 to 4 to necessary action against the Respondent No. 5 and Respondent No.5 may not be allowed to enter the house of the Petitioner without taking the permission from any authority as well as the Petitioner;*
- c) To restrain the respondent No.7 from creating any nuisance and to be only on second floor and should not come to other floors in order to disturb the peace and harmony of the petitioner till the time she vacates the house no. 026 Anand Lok as per the law;”*



2. Ms. Geeta Luthra, Senior Counsel for the Petitioner, candidly states that the reliefs sought in the present petition have been rendered infructuous in view of the settlement arrived at between the Petitioner and Respondent No. 7, who has been previously deleted from the array of parties.

3. Ms. Luthra further submits that during the course of investigation in FIR No. 62/2023, registered at P.S., Defence Colony, under Sections 341/323/34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, the State had seized certain DVRs from the residence of the Petitioner. She submits that now, since the matter stands resolved, the said DVRs should be returned.

4. In response, Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, ASC for State, submits that the DVRs form part of the case property. However, in the event the FIR itself is quashed, the State would have no objection to returning the DVRs.

5. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of with the observation that, as and when the parties move an appropriate petition for quashing of the FIR on the basis of the settlement, they may also make a request for the return of the DVRs, which shall be considered in accordance with law and in light of the statement made by Ms. Bandhopadhyay.

6. The petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025

nk