

12.05.2026

Present : Sh. K D Pachauri, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Pradeep Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for
complainant with complainant.
Insp. Mahendra Pratap Singh along with PSI Diksha
in person.

Submissions from the both the sides heard on the reply filed by the Addl. DCP subsequent to the order dated 11.02.2026 whereby report u/s 4 of SC/ST Act was called for.

It is submitted by the Insp. Mahendra Pratap Singh and PSI Diksha that on inquiry CCTV footage of the alleged place and the date of incident was examined but no such incident was found to have occurred as per the recordings. It is further submitted that one month prior to the alleged incident, there was one complaint filed by the accused persons against the complainant and one kalandra u/s 107/151 Cr.P.C was also filed against the complainant. It is also stated in the reply that there were some contradictions in the statement of the complainant regarding the date and place of the alleged incident. Hence, no FIR has been registered.

Per contra the case of incident is not covered by any CCTV camera. It is also submitted that the police officials have not willfully registered the case despite the statement given by the complainant as well as statements of other witnesses.

Heard. Perused.

During the hearing of the case certain queries have been made to the SHO wherein he stated that he had also taken down the statements of Rohit S/o Raj Kumar, R/o B- 220, Mangolpuri, Delhi and Rishipal S/o Sh. Hukumpal, R/o F-1037,

Mangolpuri, Delhi. SHO asked to furnish the copies of the statements. The copies were supplied.

Perusal of the statements of Rohit and Rishipal reveals that both the persons have alleged about the castiest remarks been made to the complainant. There is no specific mentioning of date in the statement. Perusal of the statement of Rohit also mentioned that the incident took place on the road in the park.

After taking note of the complaint as well as the statements of both Rohit and Rishipal, there are sufficient material for the concerned SHO to register the FIR so that further investigation could be made out. There is mention of specific date in the complaint. So there is no reason as to why the statement of Rohit and Rishipal in context of the complaint have not been considered by the SHO. Prima facie, there seems to be willful violation of the provisions of SC/ST Act.

For the aforesaid reason, concerned ACP is directed to register the case under section SC/ST Act.

Further reply be sought from the concerned DCP as to why action under section 4 SC/ST Act be not initiated against the concerned official for none compliance of the provisions of the Act.

Put up for compliance/ further proceedings on 30.05.2026.

(SHIVAJI ANAND)
ASJ-II/SPECIAL JUDGE NDPS/
NORTH-WEST/ROHINI COURTS/
DELHI/12.05.2026