



\$~1(Full Bench)

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

+ W.P.(C) 1917/2026

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas Kumar and Ms. Zaineb Praveen, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel (Criminal) GNCTD with Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC, Mr. Aryan Sachdeva, Ms. Sakshi Jha, Mr. A. Kumar, Advs. for State.

DCP Raja Banthia(North) and ACP Vidushi Kaushik(Sadar Bazaar).

Mr. Chetan Sharma, Sr. Adv., ASG Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Tanishq Srivastava Mr. Abhijit Chakravarty, Ms. Yamini Singh and Mr. Bhanu Gulati, Mr. Vedant Sood, Advs. for BCD.

Ms.Anu Bagai with Ms.Aanchal Pundir, Advs for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MR. NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE

ORDER

%

02.04.2026

1. Heard Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate and Ms. Zaineb Praveen, Advocate in person. Mr. Chetan Sharma, learned ASG, Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel (Criminal), GNCTD and Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari,



learned ASC have also been heard. Mr. T. Singhdev, learned counsel representing the Bar Council of Delhi is also present.

2. The cognizance of this petition was taken by the Division Bench of this Court *suo motu* on 09.02.2026.

3. Having regard to the nature of incident, which was reported, the matter was referred to this Larger Bench, which passed an order on 09.02.2026, wherein the concern expressed by all present on the said date about the reported incident was noted.

4. A statement was made by Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel (Criminal), GNCTD, on instructions, that two rival complaints were received by the Police authorities and on the basis of said complaints; two FIRs were lodged under appropriate sections of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The learned Principal District and Sessions Judge was also directed to submit a report to the alleged incident after making inquiries from all concerned.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances, we had directed the Bar Council of Delhi to take cognizance of the incident in terms of Section 35 of the Advocates Act, 1961. The Commissioner of Police, Delhi was also directed to take stock of the security situation in all District Courts with a further direction that they shall take appropriate steps to enhance the security in each District Court in consultation with the respective Principal District and Sessions Judges.

6. Having regard to the sensitivity of the issue/incident, we had also directed that FIRs shall be investigated by an Officer of the Rank of Assistant Commissioner of Police under the direct supervision of the DCP.

7. A direction was also given to provide adequate security to Mr. Vikas



Kumar, which was made available to him subject to outcome of periodic review of the threat perception by the Police authorities.

8. Today, we have been informed by Sh. Lao that investigations in respect of both the FIRs have been completed and the final report is likely to be filed before the Magistrate concerned within a week. Accordingly, we provide that on the basis of the investigation conducted in two FIRs, the final report by the Police Authorities shall be filed before the Magistrate concerned.

9. The concerned parties will have opportunity to lodge their protest petition, if they are, in any manner, aggrieved by the final report.

10. So far as the security provided to Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate is concerned, we have been informed that security has been provided and the security, which was provided is continuing and further that the review relating to threat perception has been conducted, the result whereof is awaited.

11. We, thus, direct that the security to Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate shall continue to be provided subject to outcome of the review, which is said to have been conducted for assessing the threat perception to his life.

12. On an earlier date, we were informed by the Police authorities that stock of the security *bandobast* in each district court was taken in consultation with the Principal District and Sessions Judges and wherever needed, extra police force was deployed.

13. We, thus, direct that security *bandobast*, which have been put in place in each district court in Delhi shall continue and shall be reviewed on regular basis bi-monthly by the Police authorities in consultation with the respective Principal District and Sessions Judges.



14. Learned counsel representing the Bar Council of Delhi, Mr. Singhdev has informed that notices to the concerned advocates were issued by the Bar Council soliciting their replies and opportunity of personal hearing has also been given to them. We, thus, also provide that the proceedings instituted/initiated by the Bar Council of Delhi shall be taken to their logical conclusion.

15. In view of the aforesaid, we are of the opinion that the instant petition has lived its life and no purpose would be served in continuing these proceedings. The petition, thus, stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

16. As a post script, we record our appreciation for the assistance provided to the Court by the learned ASG, Mr. Lao, Mr. Bhandari and Mr. Singhdev. We also appreciate the steps taken by the Police authorities not only for promptly investigating the FIRs but also for making adequate arrangements relating to security in the district courts, which we hope, shall go a long way in creating a safe and secured environment so that the Courts will be able to discharge their duties and functions in the most efficient manner.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, J

APRIL 02, 2026/j