



\$~52

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 20.01.2026

+

W.P.(CRL) 201/2026 & CRL.M.A. 1922/2026

KAWALJIT KAUR & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Ms. Urvashi Singh, Advocate
(through videoconferencing) with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC for R-1 & R-2.
Mr. Madhu Sudan, Advocate for R-3,
R-4 & R-5.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

1. For better understanding, the prayer clause of this writ petition is extracted below:

“a) Issue Writ, in nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to Respondent No.2 to take immediate action to remove the CCTV camera which is rotatable and is with sound recording installed of by the Respondent No.4 and the Respondent No.5 in the common area covering the entrance of the flat of the Petitioner.

b) Direct the Respondent No.3 President of the R.W.A (Regd.) of H Block Naraina Vihar to make cameras functional as shown in the Annexure P1 in the side area of flat No. H-202 and Flat No. H- 203, Uday Niketan, Phase-II, Naraina Vihar, New Delhi-110028.

c) To direct the Respondent No.2 and the Respondent No.3 to compensate the Petitioners @Rs 20,000 each for the inaction and violation of the right to liberty of the Petitioner.



d) To grant protection to the Petitioner and her minor son from the Respondent No.4 and the Respondent No.5 considering the threats given by the Respondent No.4 and the Respondent No.5.
e) To stay the proceedings that may have been filed by the Respondent No.2 before the Court of the Special Executive Magistrate, Moti Nagar (West), Delhi during the pendency of the present petition.
f) To direct the Respondent No.3 to not to remove the date put up by the Petitioner which secures the flat of the Petitioner, the staircase of flat No. H-206 to H-212 and does not obstruct the ingress and egress of the other flat owners (H-201- H- 212) and Pass any other relief that this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper as per the facts and circumstances of the case to meet the ends of justice. "

(Bold words as in the prayer clause itself)

2. Learned ASC on behalf of respondents no.1 and 2 appearing on advance intimation strongly opposes the writ petition as not even maintainable.
3. As is obvious from the nature of reliefs sought, that too, against a private association and individual persons, the same are civil disputes and not amenable to adjudication in criminal writ jurisdiction, except the relief sought in prayer clause (d).
4. The prayer clause (d) seeks protection for the petitioner and her child from respondents no.4 and 5. Without entering into the issue as to whether respondents no.4 and 5 pose any threat to the petitioner and her child, I am of the considered view that petitioner and her child cannot be denied protection where they apprehend any harm. Learned ASC also, in all fairness, does not dispute that it is the duty of the local police to grant



2026:DHC:476



protection to the petitioner and her child from any possible threat.

5. In view of the aforesaid, this writ petition is disposed of directing the State (respondents no.1 and 2) to ensure protection to petitioner and her minor child and for that purpose, mobile phone number of the Beat Constable be shared with her so that whenever in distress, she may call up the Beat Constable, who shall act according to law. Pending application also stands disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

JANUARY 20, 2026/ry