



\$~68

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1797/2020

TANU GUPTAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Gupta, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Jain and Mrs. Monika Aggarwal, Advocates for R-2 & 3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

% **28.03.2026**

The matter has been listed today i.e. 28.03.2026, since 02.03.2026 was declared a holiday in terms of Notification No.64/G-4/Genl.-I/DHC dated 27.02.2026.

CRL.M.A. 4282/2026(for clarification of orders)

1. Application under Section 528 B.N.S.S. has been filed on behalf of the Respondents No. 2 and 3 seeking clarification of the word “same locality” in Order dated 21.10.2024.
2. It is submitted that while the Respondents had agreed to provide the alternate accommodation but the learned District Judge in the impugned Order had clearly provided that Respondent No. 1 “*is directed to make the suitable arrangements for the residence of the Complainant in any alternate accommodation and pay its rent regularly if the same is a rented accommodation*”.
3. This Order which was under challenge, which has been upheld and



the Appeal has been dismissed as is evident from Paragraphs 23 and 24 of the Order dated 21.10.2024.

4. Furthermore, the observations made by this Court are “The concern of the legislature that the woman be not thrown out of the house and be left on the road, has also been addressed by directing the husband/Respondent No.2 to provide suitable alternate accommodation on rent *in the same locality*”.

5. The record shows that it is the order of the learned District Judge, which has been upheld wherein the directions were to provide alternate suitable accommodation on rent. There were no directions that it be provided in the same locality. Consequently, the word “in the same locality” in Para 23, is hereby deleted.

6. The Application is accordingly disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

MARCH 28, 2026

N