



\$~66

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010342382026

Date of decision: 31.07.2026

Uploaded on : 01.08.2026

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2268/2026**

SUKHBIR SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Akshay, Mr. Hrithik Shokeen and
Mr. R. Gupta, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, ASC with
Mr. Abhijeet Kumar Adv. Mr.
Amisha Gupta Adv.
SI Priyanka, PS Alipur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

Madhu Jain, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking following prayer:

“i. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly a writ of mandamus, directing the Respondent No. 1 to provide protection to all the Petitioners and ensure that no harm befalls either of them, particularly, from the Respondent No. 2;

ii. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly a writ of mandamus, directing the Respondents not to interfere in the peaceful life of the Petitioners and not to cause any harm or bodily injury to the said Petitioners;



iii. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly a writ of mandamus, thereby directing the Respondents to follow the procedure established by law under Article 21 of the Constitution of India or any other law for the time being in force;

iv. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly a writ of mandamus, thereby directing the Respondents to provide adequate security to the Petitioners;

v. Pass any other orders and directions in the favor of petitioner as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper."

3. The Petitioners are residents of Village Alipur, Delhi and it is the case of the Petitioners that in the year 2022, Rohit Mann, the younger son of Petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 and the brother of Petitioner No. 3, left the family home and thereafter assumed the name 'Monty Mann Alipuriya'. They subsequently learnt that he was allegedly involved in several criminal cases registered in Delhi. Apprehending harassment on account of his activities, the Petitioners publicly disowned him by issuing a newspaper publication severing all relations and debarring him from their movable and immovable properties.

4. The grievance of the Petitioners is that despite having severed all ties with Rohit Mann, they have repeatedly been taken to different police stations and subjected to harassment, illegal detention and interrogation solely because they are related to him, though they have no involvement in any of his alleged criminal activities. Aggrieved thereby, the Petitioners have approached this Court seeking protection of their life, liberty and dignity.

5. After perusing the petition and the documents placed on record, this



Court notes that the allegations levelled by the Petitioners are vague, omnibus and general in nature. The petition does not disclose any specific date, time, place or manner in which the alleged acts of harassment or intimidation were committed by the Respondents. Apart from making broad allegations of illegal detention and custodial harassment, the Petitioners have failed to furnish any material particulars or supporting documents to substantiate the same. The narration of events is conspicuously devoid of any specific incident that would enable this Court to assess the nature or extent of the alleged infringement of the Petitioners' rights.

6. Evidently, the Petitioners have not placed on record any complaint or representation made before any superior police authority, nor have they disclosed any immediate or imminent threat to their life or liberty supported by cogent material. Mere bald assertions, unsupported by particulars, cannot by themselves justify the invocation of the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India.

7. It is well settled that the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court is to be exercised in exceptional circumstances where a clear case of violation of fundamental or legal rights is made out. In the present case, the pleadings are deficient in material particulars and do not disclose any specific act attributable to any particular police official or authority. Consequently, this Court is unable to arrive at a prima facie satisfaction that any immediate interference is warranted.

8. Moreover, this Court is of the considered view that if the Petitioners genuinely apprehend any threat to their life, liberty or safety on account of the alleged conduct of the police officials, the appropriate course would be to approach the jurisdictional Magistrate, who is competent to consider such



grievances and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. The Petitioners have not demonstrated any exceptional circumstance warranting the bypassing of such efficacious statutory remedy and the direct invocation of the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

9. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

10. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

**MADHU JAIN
(JUDGE)**

JULY 31, 2026/b/rm