



\$~147

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8014/2025**

INDU DAWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Arora, Ms. Sarita
Pandey and Mr. Pulkit Dahiya, Advs.

versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE DELHI AND ORS.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Pavitaa Kaur, Mr. Shiven
Asthana, Advs. for R2
Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj (CGSC)
along with Mr. Amit Kumar Rana,
Advs. for Delhi Police

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

29.05.2025

CM APPL.35190/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 8014/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging (i) inaction on the part of the respondent no.1/Commissioner of Police, Delhi in taking requisite measures under Rule 22 (1) and (2) of the Delhi Maintenance and Welfare of the Parents and Senior Citizens Rules, 2017 (amendment) [hereinafter referred as 'Rules, 2017 (amendment)'] and (ii) inaction on the part of the respondent no.2/District Magistrate, South Delhi in discharging the mandate under Rule 22(3) of the Rules, 2017 (amendment).
4. The present petition has been filed in backdrop of the petitioner



allegedly being subjected to continuous harassment and abuse by respondent no.3 (daughter-in-law of the petitioner). It is submitted that the petitioner is the absolute owner of property bearing No. 2/31, 2nd Floor, Sarvpriya Vihar, New Delhi-110016 and had been residing therein with her son and daughter-in-law/respondent no.3. Even after the demise of her son, in the year 2024, the petitioner continued to reside in the said property with her grandchild and respondent no.3.

5. It is submitted that the petitioner filed various complaints before the P.S. Malviya Nagar and had also sent various representations to the Deputy Commissioner Police and Police Commissioner of Delhi, however, no action has been taken till date.

6. It is further submitted that the petitioner has also filed a complaint on 11.03.2025 under Rule 22 (3)(1) of the Rules, 2017 (amendment) read with The Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007 before respondent no.2 seeking eviction of respondent no.3 from the aforesaid property.

7. However, it is submitted that while the aforesaid application and representation remain pending before the concerned authorities, the respondent no.3 has been harassing the petitioner and has gone to the extent of installing microphone equipped CCTV cameras inside the bedroom door, and another in the living room in the said property, to monitor every movement of the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is genuinely apprehensive as regards her security in and around the respondent no.3

8. Learned counsel for the respondent no.2 submits that the aforesaid application of the petitioner filed before the respondent no.2 shall be considered expeditiously. It is further assured that in case any interim



protection is sought by the petitioner, the same shall also be considered by respondent no.2 and appropriate orders shall be passed thereon. Let the same be done expeditiously and preferably within a period of two weeks from today, after hearing the respondent no.3.

9. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MAY 29, 2025/uk