

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

WRIT PETITION (CRL.) NO(s). 60 OF 2009

NISHA PRIYA BHATIA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date: 15/01/2010 This Petition was called on for pronouncement  
of judgment today.

For Petitioner(s)

Petitioner-In-Person

For Respondent(s)

\*\*\*\*\*

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Harjit Singh Bedi pronounced the  
judgment of the Court for a Bench comprising of His  
Lordship and Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.M. Panchal.

The writ petition is dismissed in terms of the signed  
non-reportable judgment.

(KALYANI GUPTA)  
SR. P.A.

(PHOOLAN WATI ARORA)  
COURT MASTER

[SIGNED NON-REPORTABLE JUDGMENT IS PLACED ON  
FILE.]

[Non-Reportable]  
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CRL.) NO. 60 OF 2009

MS. NISHA PRIYA BHATIA

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

JUDGMENT

HARJIT SINGH BEDI,J.

1. We had heard the petitioner-in-person at length. Although  
this is a miscellaneous matter and at the stage of fresh hearing,

we had reserved judgment for the reason that the petitioner was surcharged and appeared to be emotionally disturbed and prudence dictated that we should not make any order adverse to her in her presence.

2. During the course of arguments, the petitioner repeatedly referred to the fact that she had been sexually intimidated by her senior colleagues in office and that they had misused their positions and amassed huge fortunes. She also emphasized that it was on account of her attempts to highlight the misconduct of these officers that she had been harassed & hounded time and again and had even been denied her service dues.

3. We have gone through the petition as also the documents filed and find that the allegations made by the petitioner have been enquired into by several independent bodies including a Committee headed by Dr. Renuka Vishwanathan and supervised by the Cabinet Secretary and that no merit had been found in the allegations levelled by her.

4. The record further shows that the allegations made by the petitioner have at one time or the other been examined by the National Human Rights Commission and the National Commission for Women and they too had not granted her any relief.

5. We also see from paragraph No.18 of the petition that some over-lapping matters are pending before the Delhi High Court. For all these reasons, we are unable to grant any relief to the petitioner under Article 32 of the Constitution of India. She may however pursue her remedies before the Delhi High Court or elsewhere.

6. The Writ Petition is dismissed for the above reasons.

.....J.  
(HARJIT SINGH BEDI)

.....J.  
(J.M. PANCHAL)

NEW DELHI,  
JANUARY 15, 2010.