



\$~24

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

+ **W.P.(C) 16738/2022, CM APPL. 52827/2022**

SH AKASH DEEP

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Jaspreet, Advocate.

versus

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCHEDULED CASTES

.....Respondent

Through: Mr T. P. Singh, Sr. Central Govt.
Counsel for R1.

Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC with Mr.
Sangeet Sibou, Mr. Aniket Kumar
Singh&Mr. Priyansh Raj Singh,
Advs.

Mr. Tushar Sannu&Mr. Parvin
Bansal, Advs. for DJB.

Insp Sandeep and SI Udit, PS
Ranhola.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **06.04.2026**

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

“a. Issue a Writ of Mandamus/Certiorari or any other Writ/Orderand/or Direction/s, thereby, setting aside the Order passed by theRespondent vide minutes of meeting dated 03.10.2022, as thesame is in complete contravention of the Rules of Procedure of the National Commission for Scheduled Castes.

b. Pass any other order/s as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and the circumstances of the present case.”

2. The case of the petitioner is that he is one of the directors of a



company known as Salvation Security Services Pvt. Ltd., which is engaged in the business of providing security services at the site of the Delhi Jal Board (“**DJB**”). The petitioner claims that, in connection with an incident that had occurred at the DJB site, he was falsely implicated in an FIR arising out of the said incident. He further claims that a complaint was also filed against him and certain other individuals before the National Commission for Scheduled Castes (“**NCSC**”).

3. As per the petitioner, the NCSC passed the impugned order dated 03.10.2022, whereby the police officials investigating the FIR were directed to add Section 3(1)(r)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act, 1989 (“**SCST Act**”) in the said FIR. By way of the said order, the NCSC also directed the concerned police officials to arrest the petitioner.

4. The petitioner, however, contends that he was neither called upon for a hearing before the NCSC, nor served a copy of the complaint. This, the petitioner claims, is in contravention of the Rules of Procedure of the National Commission for Scheduled Castes, 1931. In these circumstances, the petitioner has filed the present petition, challenging the legality of the said proceedings and the impugned order.

5. This Court, *vide* order dated 06.12.2022, stayed the impugned order dated 03.10.2022, passed by the NCSC. It further emerges from the record that pursuant to the earlier recommendations, the FIR had already been lodged against the petitioner on 30.09.2022. The said FIR is not under challenge in the instant writ petition.

6. The Court finds that since the police have already registered an FIR for the alleged offence, the same must be taken to its logical conclusion. The petitioner, therefore, ought to have availed appropriate legal remedies to



challenge the said FIR, if he so decides.

7. At this point of time, there is no reason why the NCSC should continue its proceedings or issue any directions, as has been done on 03.10.2022. Once the police had already initiated action, the NCSC should have refrained from passing the impugned order.

8. Accordingly, the impugned order stands set aside. The writ petition stands disposed of. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

9. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 6, 2026

tr