

16 Ct. Cases / 20199/2026 TECH CLINIC CONNECT PRIVATE
LIMITED Vs. PARMILA DEVI /0 (Shalimar Bagh)

23.05.2026

Undersigned is having pendency of approximately 8300 cases in this court.

Present: Sh Raghav Mehdiratta, Ld. Counsel for
complainant.
IO ASI Seema Dhaka in person.

ATR filed.

It is submitted by EO ASI Seema Dhaka that she is also the IO wherein the proposed accused is the complainant. EO has further submitted that during the inquiry of the other complaint which was filed by proposed accused it was found out that the allegations made upon the complainant regarding the molestation are still being investigated.

Further the CDR and the attendance register of the Dr. Vikas in the present matter was also checked which reveals that on the date of incidence the Doctor was neither present at the clinic, nor, his location was found to be of clinic.

Court has asked the EO that when she has been assigned the inquiry of the other complaint which has been filed by the proposed accused, then why she has been assigned the present complaint which is allegedly against the complainant(proposed accused) in this case.

It is submitted by IO that both the enquiries are marked to her and she shall be discussing the same with the senior officials as there may be conflict of interest.

Ld counsel for complainant has submitted that logically the present enquiry in this case should not have been assigned to the EO who is already conducting the enquiry wherein the proposed accused is a complainant.

Submissions heard.

The submissions made by Id counsel seems to be justified and logical also.

At this stage, court has also perused the status report which reveals that a video clip has been perused of the hospital wherein proposed accused Ekta Bansal is seen, who is negotiating to the hospital staff, and there is another video wherein Ekta Bansal is demanding money from Dr. Anil for settlement of the matter.

At this stage, IO has submitted that complainant/ Dr. Anil has also provided original audio clips regarding demand of money for settlement of the matter and same needs to be further investigated.

IO seeks some time to verify the audio clips and the video clips so that a final conclusion may be drawn.

Heard.

Put up for final ATR on NDOH.

Furthermore, court deems it fit to direct the SHO concerned to look into the matter that whether the same EO shall investigate both the matter or not as there will be conflict of interest.

List on **25.07.2026**

(Gaurav Katariya)
JMFC-7(NW)/RC/Delhi
23.05.2026