



\$~16, 17

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1265/2023**

KADAM SINGH CHAPRANA AND ANRPetitioners

Through: Ms. Sushmita Chaudhary, Advocate.

versus

MR SANJEEV MISHRA AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for State
with Mr. Satbir Singh, Insp., PS-
Jaitpur.

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2038/2023**

KADAM SINGH CHAPRANA & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Ms. Sushmita Chaudhary, Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for State
with Mr. Satbir Singh, Insp., PS-
Jaitpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

26.08.2025

%

1. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, was filed seeking directions for initiation of action on the Complaints made by the Petitioner and also seeking directions to provide protection to the Petitioners. During the course of the proceedings, this Court by order dated 20th July, 2023, issued the following directions:



“5. In the meanwhile, the number of Beat Constable and SHO of Police Station Jaitpur, New Delhi be provided to the petitioners who will be readily available to them in case need so arises and the officials of P.S. Jaitpur, New Delhi including SHO are directed to provide adequate protection to the petitioners from respondent no. 2, in case such circumstances arise.”

2. Aggrieved by the alleged non-compliance of the aforesaid directions, the Petitioner has filed the present contempt petition invoking Section 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. It is argued that the SHO of P.S. Jaitpur has failed to provide adequate protection as directed by this Court, despite multiple complaints made by the Petitioner. Reliance is placed on the complaints dated 25th July, 2023 and 2nd August, 2023 to emphasise that despite having approached the concerned SHO, no action has been taken.

3. Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for State, submits that in compliance with order dated 20th July, 2023, the contact details of the Beat Constable and the SHO of P.S. Jaitpur, have already been shared with the Petitioners and a report to this effect has also been filed.

4. The Court has considered the aforementioned submissions. At the outset, it must be clarified that, in the event the complaints referred above, have not elicited any action from the police, the appropriate remedy available to the Petitioners is to approach the concerned Magistrate for registration of an FIR, if so advised. The mere failure of the police to register an FIR, particularly where it has formed the opinion that no cognizable offence is made out, cannot, by itself, constitute contempt of court.

5. As regards the directions issued to the SHO and the beat constable to share their contact details and extend protection to the Petitioners, it must be emphasized that such responsibilities are part of the State's inherent



obligation to maintain law and order. Any complaint made by the Petitioners must still be assessed on its merits by the concerned SHO, who is required to act in accordance with law. The Court is of the view that general directions to provide protection cannot be interpreted as creating an enforceable right to seek contempt merely because an FIR was not registered pursuant to a complaint.

6. In view of the above, the Court finds no merit in the present petitions and no further directions are deemed necessary.

7. Accordingly, the present petitions along with pending application(s), if any, are disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 26, 2025

nk