



\$~73

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 921/2026**

**RAJENDER SINGH WASON ALIAS PAPPI WASON & ANR.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Kanika Agnihotri and Mr. Karan Negi, Advocates with petitioners in person.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Gupta, Advocate for R-1.  
Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyay, ASC with Mr. Abhijeet Kumar and Ms. Amisha Gupta, Advocates and SI Lalit Kumar for R-2 to R-5.  
Mr. Annirudh Sharma, Advocate for private respondent no.6 with respondent no.6 (*through video conferencing*)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**ORDER**

% **24.03.2026**

**CRL.M.A. 8732/2026 (exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(CRL) 921/2026 & CRL.M.A. 8731/2026 (stay)**

2. The prayer clause of this petition is extracted below:

**"PRAYER**

*In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, it is most humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to: -*

*i. Allow the present Petition;*

*ii. Direct the Respondent No. 5 to remedy his illegal acts by removing*



*the illegally placed lock on the property of the Petitioners;*  
*iii. Direct the Respondents, particularly Respondent No.2 to take appropriate action on the representation of the Petitioners dated 08.03.2026;*  
*iv. Direct the Respondent No. 4 to receive and thereafter, take action on the complaint of the Petitioners' qua the Respondent Nos. 6 and 7 in accordance with law;*  
*v. Direct the Police Authority, particularly Respondent Nos. 1-5 to provide security to the Petitioners to ensure that they have protection from the threat of life that the conduct of Respondent Nos. 6 and 7 have posed for the Petitioners, and that no harm and/or offence is committed to the persons or property of the Petitioners;*  
*vi. Any other further order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.*  
*And for this act of kindness the petitioners Shall forever remain humbly grateful and Shall duty bound pray."*

3. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioners that the private respondents have illegally placed their locks on the subject property and the local police is not taking any action. The subject property according to learned counsel for petitioners is the premises bearing no. 313/57/7 and 313/57/6, Anand Nagar, Inderlok, Delhi. It is also submitted by learned counsel that according to information received by petitioners, the local SDM has initiated proceedings under Section 164 BNSS pertaining to another property which bears no.313/70 and Plot No.124 & 125 (Old Plot No.57/5), Anand Nagar, Inderlok, Delhi, but those proceedings have no connection with the premises which are subject matter of this petition. Further, it is contended by learned counsel for petitioners that the present respondent no.6 had filed a civil suit, which got dismissed because the present respondent no.6 was admittedly not in possession of the premises which are subject matter of the present petition.

4. Learned ASC appearing on advance intimation accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.2 to 5. Mr. Mohit Gupta, learned counsel for



respondent no.1 also accepts notice. The respondent no.6 has personally appeared through video conferencing accompanied with his counsel.

5. In response to a specific query, it is stated by learned ASC that locks at the subject premises were not placed by the local police as there is no such order of sealing passed by the concerned SDM. The respondent no.6 as well as her counsel also categorically state that the locks at the subject premises were not placed by them. It would be appropriate to note that respondent no.6 is repeatedly asked in Hindi and he repeatedly states that the locks at the subject premises were not placed by him.

6. At this stage, during dictation of order, respondent no.6 submits that locks placed at premises bearing no. 313/57/7 and 313/57/6, Anand Nagar, Inderlok, Delhi were placed by him. Even learned counsel for respondent no.6 expresses regret and anguish that respondent no.6 has now changed his statement during the course of dictation, so he does not wish to represent him any more. Be that as it may, I have further asked respondent no.6 in Hindi as to when he placed locks at the subject premises and he submits that he placed his locks on 20.02.2026. Respondent no.6 further states that when he found brand new locks on the subject premises, he asked the respondent no.7 as to whether those were his locks but respondent no.7 denied, so respondent no.6 removed those new locks and placed his locks. It is specifically stated by respondent no.6 that he did not obtain any judicial order before placing his locks at the subject premises.

7. Apart from the above mentioned flip-flop in the statement of respondent no.6, it also appears *prima facie* to be a cognizable offence. The official respondents are directed to examine this aspect and investigate after registration of FIR.



8. For the time being, I find no reason to allow respondent no.6 to continue in illegally obtained possession of the subject premises. Therefore, SHO Sarai Rohilla, the respondent no.4 of this case is directed to forthwith remove locks of the subject premises, which are premises bearing no. 313/57/7 and 313/57/6, Anand Nagar, Inderlok, Delhi and hand over possession of the same to the petitioners.

9. The respondents are directed to file counter-affidavits within four weeks, to be followed by rejoinder affidavits, if any, within next two weeks.

10. Subject to petitioners taking steps within one week, notice through all modes be issued to the respondent no.7, returnable on 18.05.2026 in Advance List.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA, J**

**MARCH 24, 2026/ry**