



\$~34

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(CRL) 2385/2025 & CRL.M.A. 27484/2025

MOHD RAFEEQUE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tejas Mehta, Advocate

versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for the State
with Mr. Kshitiz Garg, Advocate
along with SI Parveen, PS Special
Cell

SI Satish Kumar, PS Jaitpur

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

09.10.2025

%

1. The Petitioner alleges that on 26th May, 2025, in his absence, unidentified individuals forcibly entered his premises, misbehaved with his wife and daughter, and inquired about his whereabouts. Upon being informed that the Petitioner was outside Delhi and expected to return on 29th May, 2025, they issued threats and left the premises.
2. It is further alleged that on 29th May, 2025, the same individuals returned and aggressively demanded that the Petitioner accompany them, claiming to be personnel from the Special Cell. When asked to produce identification or any official notice, they refused and threatened the Petitioner with dire consequences.
3. In such circumstances, the present writ petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:

"a. Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus and/or Certiorari or any other appropriate writ or direction directing the Respondents to ensure that no coercive action is taken against the Petitioner without"



following the due process of law; AND/OR
b. Direct the Respondents to conduct a fair, time-bound inquiry into the incident dated 26.05.2025 and 29.05.2025 and identify the individuals who claimed to be. Special Cell personnel; AND/OR
c. Direct the Respondents to provide adequate police protection to the Petitioner and his family in view of the grave threat to their life and liberty; AND/OR
d. Direct the Respondents to supply all information and records pertaining to any alleged complaint, FIR or inquiry, If any, pending against the Petitioner; AND/OR
e. Pass such other or further orders as may be deemed just and proper in the interest of justice.”

4. Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for the State, denies the allegations made in the petition. He submits that the Petitioner is a suspect in relation to a complaint which is presently under inquiry. Nevertheless, he assures the Court that any action taken against the Petitioner shall be strictly in accordance with due process of law. He further points out that no formal complaint regarding the alleged incidents has been made by the Petitioner, and hence, the veracity of the allegations is denied. However, he states that if and when such a complaint is filed, the same shall be duly considered and examined in accordance with law.

5. As regards the request for police protection, Petitioner may submit a representation to the concerned SHO, who shall conduct a threat perception assessment and take action, if so warranted, in accordance with law.

6. In light of the foregoing, no further orders are required for.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of along with pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 9, 2025/ab