



\$~46

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1618/2025**

ANITA BABU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sermon Rawat, Mr. Vikas Rathee, Ms. Aastha, Mr. Harshit Jain and Ms. Amrita Jha, Advocates with Petitioner.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC (Crl) for the State with SI Sachin Sharma, PS Pandav Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

% **16.05.2025**

CRL.M.A. 15260/2025 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 1618/2025

3. Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*hereinafter referred to as 'B.N.S.S. '*), has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner, Anita Babu directing the State to provide protection to the Petitioner against the threat to life and liberty.
4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that on account of hateful mails posted against the Petitioner by the Respondent No. 3, who happens to



be a sitting MLA of District, she has been receiving lot of hate responses from the various people on the mail and there are also some goons of the Respondent No. 3, who were standing outside the colony from whom the Petitioner has an apprehension of safety of her life.

5. It is further stated that the Complaints have been made by the Police about one month back but no action has been taken.

6. Copy of the Enquiry Report has been handed over in the Court by the State/Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 wherein it is submitted that an enquiry has been conducted on her Complaint and the same has already been filed *vide* Report dated 05.05.2025. Let the same be taken on record.

7. Essentially, the grievance of the Petitioner in regard to the hate mails which have been posted by the Respondent No. 3. It is also stated that there are disputes about employment of a contractor for providing services of Clerk etc, which has resulted in some grievances with the erstwhile employees, who are working on daily basis in the colony.

8. Considering the nature of the submissions made, it is evident that it is not a case, which warrants any kind of police protection and the remedy lies elsewhere, which the Petitioner is at liberty to make. Even though, there is no *prima facie* threat perception disclosed in the Petition, the SHO would share his mobile number and of the Beat Constable with the Petitioner, who shall respond promptly to any call that may be received from the Petitioner.

9. The Petition is disposed of accordingly.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

MAY 16, 2025/RS