



\$~51

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3140/2024**

ANURAG KULSHRESTHAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

CBI CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
DIRECTOR, PRAVEEN SOOD & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj,
SPP, CBI for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

21.03.2025

1. The present petition is filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India essentially seeking a myriad of directions to the respondents.
2. This Court by order dated 18.10.2024 had noted that the prayers sought in the petition are highly expansive, disjointed, vague and non-specific and granted an opportunity to the petitioner to specify the relief that he is seeking.
3. The petitioner has not filed any document specifying the reliefs he wishes to seek.
4. From a bare perusal of the petition, it appears that the petitioner is harbouring apprehensions that he is being subjected to illegal surveillance and that he is being tracked, hacked and followed, which as per him requires in depth investigation. The petitioner is also alleging that his life is under threat. Other vague allegations have also been made in the petition.
5. The learned Special Public Prosecutor for Respondent



No.1 submits that a petition of such a nature seeking vague reliefs ought not to be entertained by this Court. She, however, fairly submits that if any application is preferred by the petitioner, the same would be dealt with in accordance with law.

6. This Court is aware that a little latitude is to be given to litigants who appear in person.

7. However, it cannot be ignored that the petitioner has filed the present petition by invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court. The petitioner seems to be labouring under paranoia that he is the subject of a large conspiracy on multiple accounts. The nature of reliefs, as already noted by this Court previously, are vague, disjointed and expansive.

8. The extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court cannot be invoked in a routine manner to address such vague and speculative apprehensions. If such petitions are entertained by this Court, it would be akin to opening a pandora's box.

9. Needless to say, if any application is preferred by the petitioner to appropriate authorities in relation to any legitimate complaint, the same shall be dealt with in accordance of law.

10. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MARCH 21, 2025