



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

% *Reserved on 21st August, 2025*

Pronounced on: 07th November, 2025

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2353/2021**

LALITA PHARTIYAL

W/O Late Link Dinesh Phartiyal

Vill. Pilkholi, P.O.- Pilkholi (Ranikhet)

Distt. Almora, (Uttarakhand).

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shiva Nand Mishra, Adv.

versus

1. Delhi Police

Through Commissioner Of Police

Mso Building, Ip Estate, New Delhi.

2. Ministry Of Home Affairs Through Secretary

North Block, New Delhi.

3. Chief Of Army Staff

South Block, New Delhi-110001

4. Central Bureau Of Investigation

Through CBI Director,

Plot Noo 5-B, 6th Floor, Cgo Complex,

Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

5. Commanding Officer

16 Kumaon, C/0 56 APOO.

.....Respondents

Through:

Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyaya, ASC with
Mr. Abhijeet Kumar and Ms. Amisha
Gupta, Advs.

Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj, CGSC for
UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA



J U D G M E N T

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

1. Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter referred to as 'Cr.P.C.'*) has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner/Lalita Phartiyal for appropriate directions for a Court monitored investigation in the alleged murder of her son, Lance Naik Dinesh Kumar Phartiyal.
2. *Briefly stated*, deceased Lance Naik Dinesh Kumar Phartiyal No.4198416-Y was serving in the Indian Army and was posted to 16 Kumaon located at Uttarakhand. On 03.09.2017, the deceased was illegally routed by Respondent No.5 Commanding Officer to work as a buddy of law qualified officer Colonel Ajay Yadav (now Retired) till 08.01.2018 at his residence 13 Church Road, Delhi Cantt., New Delhi, against his wish. While so appointed, he had to prepare uniform of Colonel Ajay Yadav, carry out domestic chorus such as bringing of milk, etc.
3. The deceased used to talk to his family members on regular basis on mobile phone, as to how he was being humiliated and harassed by Colonel Ajay Yadav (Retired) and Bhaskar Dutt, another buddy of Colonel Ajay Yadav during his duties as buddy at his residence.
4. On 07.01.2018 at 05:04 PM, an information was received vide DD No. 27 A of Delhi Police that Lance Naik Dinesh Phartiyal has committed suicide at the residence of Colonel Ajay Yadav and the case was marked to ASI Bhopal Singh, Delhi Police.
5. On 07.01.2018 at 07:11 PM, another information was received from Base Hospital Delhi Cantt. (**BHDC**) vide DD No.33A of Delhi Police that deceased had hanged himself, as was informed to ASI Bhopal Singh



3198/PCR and to do the needful. MLC No.12/01/18 dated 07.01.2018 prepared by BHDC, stated that the deceased was brought there by one ASI Parsuram at about 17:55 hours and was declared dead at 18:30 hours. Initially, it was mentioned in the MLC, '*Brought Dead* (cause unknown)', but subsequently, it was changed to '*Found Dead* (cause unknown)'. The sketch in the MLC shows that there was a ligature mark in front of the neck of the deceased.

6. Thereafter, on 08.01.2018, the dead body of the deceased was handed over by Subedar Major Govinda Rao J., Chief Ward Master BHDC to ASI Bhopal Singh, Delhi Police and Handing/Taking over Certificate of dead body dated 08.01.2018 was prepared.

7. According to Military Police, occurrence & Investigation Report raised by Havaldar R. K. Gupta, Lance Naik Bhaskar Dutt saw the deceased hanging at the residence of Colonel and he informed Col. Ajay Yadav, who immediately arrived to his Officers Married Quarter (OMQ) and saw that Lance Naik Dinesh Kumar Phartiyal was hanging. He immediately dialled on 100 and CMP Control Room and immediately took him to BHDC, where the Doctor declared him *found dead*.

8. According to the *Inquest Report* was prepared. ASI Bhopal Singh along with one PSI Ajeet Singh reached the crime scene on receiving information, where they saw the deceased hanging in the roof (Chhat Kunda) with Single Bed Sheet. They took the ligature material under custody and sealed it in a white colour Pulinda and kept in the Malkhana. Thereafter, they took him to BHDC with the help of ASI Parsuram, where he was declared *Brought Dead*. The dead body of deceased was kept in



Mortuary of Deen Dayal Upadhyay Hospital for identification and by the next of kin.

9. On 07.01.2018 at around 05.30 P.M., Delhi Police called the father of deceased and told him that his son is admitted in ICU of BHDC and asked him to reach immediately. Thereafter, Mr. Deepankar Phartiyal, younger brother of the deceased, reached BHDC in the evening at around 18:00 hours on the same day. He found that no representative of Delhi Police or Military Police was present there. He was initially informed by BHDC administration that his brother was serious in ICU and he could meet him there. Subsequently, he was told that his brother is no more. His request to see the dead body of his brother was refused by BHDC administration.

10. Dead body of the deceased was kept in the mortuary of BHDC for whole night. Spouse and other family members of the deceased also reached BHDC late night on 07.01.2017. However, the Petitioner (wife of deceased) and her other family members, were allowed to see only the face of the dead body at around 10.00 AM on 08.01.2018 in the Mortuary.

11. On 08.01.2018, the Post-Mortem was conducted; Viscera of the deceased was taken and dead body of the deceased was handed over to the next of kin of the deceased. Post-mortem Report in respect of the deceased was handed over to the Indian Army. Thereafter, Psychological Autopsy Report in respect of the deceased was finally prepared on 1200402018 by Major Sohan Lal, Medical Officer, Trained in Psychiatry, 92 Base Hospital.

12. On 08.01.2018, the Petitioner (wife of deceased) filed a Complaint before the SHO, P.S. Delhi Cantt. Complaining ill-treatment and torture of the deceased by Col. Ajay Yadav and his helper, during service of the



deceased as buddy. She claimed that high level independent investigation may be undertaken in murder of the deceased (her husband).

13. Mr. Deepankar Phartiyal suspecting foul play in the Post Mortem Report, immediately rushed up to DDU Hospital raising various issues. In April 2018, Mr. Deepankar Phartiyal received *Post Mortem Report PM No. 46/2018 DDU Hospital from Delhi Police*, where was no 'Note' and it was opined that the cause of death is *due to asphyxia caused by ligature hanging by using cloth like material; manner of death is suicide*. Dr. Neeraj Kumar Garg took away the Post Mortem Report from him contending that fresh Post Mortem Report would be issued after few days.

14. Thereafter, fresh Post Mortem Report with same PM No. 46/2018 DDU Hospital was generated, wherein 'notes' was inserted and opinion was given that the cause of death and manner of death is kept pending till the receipt of FSL report of blood and viscera.

15. On 20.01.2018, the Petitioner wrote to Commissioner of Delhi Police for registration of FIR, but no action has been taken till date. She also lodged Complaint with authorities of Indian Army in response to which Court of Inquiry ('CoI') was ordered to investigate the matter and to delve into all issues and questions raised by the Petitioner in her Complaint.

16. On 15.05.2018, she submitted two representations before Hon'ble the Chief Minister of Uttarakhand seeking CBI enquiry and Departmental enquiry into the murder of the deceased.

17. On 13/09/2018, Mr. Deepankar Phartiyal approached the IO for details of police action in the matter, which was denied contending that all the actions in this case have been initiated by the Military Police. Therefore, he submitted Application dated 13/09/2018 to SHO, PS Delhi Cantt. seeking



details of police action, if taken under Section 174 of Cr.P.C., though no reply was given by Delhi Police.

18. On 13/09/2018, Mr. Deepankar Phartiyal submitted Application before the Chief of Army Staff seeking copy of Court of Inquiry and other specific documents, but was refused by the respondents *vide* Letter No.3335/25/ Comp/DV (JO) dated 21.01.2019. He also submitted Letter dated 13.09.2018 to the Commandant of BHDC for furnishing medical documents and information held by base hospital, but again got no response.

19. The Petitioner filed RTI Application dated 29.12.2018 for the copy of Col with other relevant information and medical documents/information associated to the case of the deceased, held by the Base hospital. Thereafter, very limited information was provided to the Petitioner.

20. On 29.12.2018, younger brother of the deceased wrote RTI Application seeking certain information from the Police, which was replied *vide* Letter No.723 (ID-2628)/RTI Cell (D-I)/SWD, New Delhi, dated 28.01.2019.

21. It is submitted that from this response, it is evident that no photographer was present at the scene of crime and no photographs were taken by Delhi Police of the crime scene. Pertinently, the *Crime Visit Report* mentions the name of the photographer as HC Banwari Lal, who was claimed to be present at the crime scene, on 07.07.2018. It is apparent from the Inquest Report that Delhi Police arrived to the conclusion that the deceased committed suicide by hanging himself, without conducting any investigation. Further, the Inquest Report has no reference to collection of any evidence such as finger prints, clothes which deceased was wearing, etc., except the pulinda (single bed sheet) with which the deceased allegedly



hanged himself. No photography or videography of the crime scene was done on 07.01.2018 or any other date by the Police. CCTV footage of entry/exit to Main Gate and entry/exit to relevant room of 13, Church Road, has not been seized by the Police.

22. The mobile phone and Call Details Records of Bhaskar Dutt, first person who allegedly saw the deceased hanging, Col. Ajay Yadav, who was allotted the OMQ 13 Church Road, Mali and his family members and Mrs. Usha and others staying at 13 Church Road at the time of incident, were not examined. Almost 03 years have gone by since the murder of a Soldier, but neither FIR has been registered nor any investigation has been undertaken.

23. The Respondent Indian Army ordered for *Court of Inquiry* ('CoI') on the allegations of the Petitioner, who suspected foul play in the death of her husband. From the photographs taken by the Military Police at the crime scene, only three photographs have been submitted before the Col. Total 12 witnesses were examined in the CoI, where *Witness No.01* has stated that his statement was recorded by the Civil Police on the date of incident. *Witness No.02* has also stated in the Col that SHO, Police Station, Delhi Cantt, the Investigating Officer, Police Station, Delhi Cantt and CO, Delhi Area Provost Unit took his statement. Similarly, *Witness No.9* has stated that when he along with his senior JCO (NbRis Anand Singh) and NCO (DfrUmesh Kumar), reached at the site of incident, he found that the Commanding Officer of Delhi Area Provost Unit along with other authorities, were present there. He and his colleagues were not allowed to enter the house. He also stated that Military Police got the personal suitcase of the deceased opened, searched his personal belongings and clicked few photographs as well. It is asserted that the Military Police is not allowed to



investigate in such manner in the absence of civil police. Even otherwise, such evidences collected by them, must have been handed over to the civil police. The CoI has not been done in this case, which clearly raises *mala fide* intention of the Respondent Indian Army to screen the offenders involved in the murder of the deceased.

24. In cases where the Investigation Agency does not act in accordance with law and its inactions clearly indicates screening the offenders and protecting such powerful suspects/ accused, a Court monitored probe has to be ordered. The subsequent conduct of Indian Army in denying every information to the Petitioner on unreasonable grounds in administrative as well as RTI channel, compelled the Petitioner to file *W.P.(C)5940/2019* before this Court seeking such information/documents, which have not been provided till date. The CoI conducted apparently seems to be an eye wash and to screen the offenders.

25. Respondent's officials have submitted a document in the CoI fabricating the signature and handwriting of deceased, clearly indicating foul play against the deceased. The police and Indian Army did not intend to ensure justice to the deceased, which is apparent on the face of record as under.

26. The grounds on which the Court Monitored investigation is sought is that the deceased was found dead under mysterious circumstances and Respondent declared the murder of Petitioner's husband as suicide, without conducting any investigation. There is no record to show that the nearest Executive Magistrate was informed about the crime. The 'startling facts' in the present case need to be investigated and probed in a fair manner.



27. The Petitioner's grievance has not been heard either by the Police and by the State or Union Executive. The Delhi police without investigating, concluded the case as of suicide. The investigation by the Indian Army and Inquest Report submitted by the Police do not inspire confidence. The person who commits suicide, does so, either due to some psychiatric influence or on abetment by some other persons. In the present case, there was no reason for the deceased to commit suicide. He was medically fit and had no psychiatric symptoms. He was happily performing his duties and used to speak to his family members on video calls on regular basis. He had also spoken to his family members on 07.01.2018 in the afternoon and the family members found him very happy on the video call.

28. In a suicide case, the deceased leaves behind the reason of committing suicide either in the form of suicide note or text message or video recording, explaining the reason for committing suicide. In the present case, no Suicide Note or any reason in any other form, has been left and there is no reason for him to commit suicide. The theory of deceased committing suicide, is without any basis and appears to be hiding the true offenders, which needs to be probed in a fair manner by an independent agency.

29. Therefore, in the above circumstances and recommendations made in Psychological Autopsy Report dated 12.04.2018 submitted by Major Sohan Lal, Trained in Psychiatry, which observed "*the exact cause of his death is uncertain and his death can only be deemed equivocal where foul play can't be ruled out which entails a detailed enquiry*" an independent agency is required to conduct investigations.

30. There are various questions which arise in the manner of investigations being carried out by two agencies, i.e. Delhi Police and



Military Police, in respect of the inhabitants present at the crime scene. There is no explanation as to why such incident was not informed to the family members of deceased from the crime scene itself. It needs to be further investigated as to who is ASI Parsuram and whether this person is Police personnel and if so, what was his interest in bringing the dead body from crime scene to BHDC; who allowed him to do so and whether the case was marked to any Police personnel of this name.

31. The probability of tampering and destruction of the evidence present on the body of the deceased en-route crime scene to BHDC, cannot be overruled taking into consideration that unauthorized person had taken him. These aspects need independent investigations.

32. The name of informant is not mentioned in DD No.27A and DD No.33A of Delhi Police both dated 07.01.2018. There was delay of about 01 hour in the receiving the information about suicide as the same was at 07:11 PM, while the dead body was taken to Base Hospital at 05:55 PM, which clearly shows considerable delay of one hour sixteen minutes, on the part of BHDC officials to inform the Police and is sufficient for destroying the crucial and material evidences present on the body and inside the body of the deceased.

33. Pertinently, the family members of deceased were not allowed to see the body till the next day on 08.01.2018 at around 07:00 PM and when too, they were allowed to see the face only. DD No.33A itself substantiate that no Delhi Police Official ever visited the crime scene.

34. In the *Inquest Report*, Delhi police claims that the IO visited crime scene on 07.01.2018 and took the dead body under his custody, whereas BHDC records that one ASI Parsuram brought the dead body to BHDC and



as per records of Indian Army, Military Police took the dead body from crime scene to BHDC. Such variations in Reports of three different agencies, clearly substantiate foul play in the death of the deceased. The case diary not being maintained in the instant case, also raises various questions about the involvement of Delhi Police in the investigation of crime, which needs to be investigated by the Independent Agency.

35. The photographs of the deceased supplied by the Indian Army to the Petitioner are of 20.02.2008, whereas the death took place on 07.01.2018. The manner in which deceased was found hanging, cannot rule out that he was first killed and then hanged. Moreover, a person committing suicide would not hang himself keeping the door of the room open, giving open access from outside as is evident from the photographs. The material placed in the Inquest Report does not inspire confidence that the crime team ever visited the crime scene.

36. When and how the sample for Viscera test was collected is also doubtful, in the absence of video recording of the Post Mortem and at the time of collection of such sample. There was some overwriting in the Forensics Science Laboratory, Government of NCT of Delhi documents, which were not signed by the IO. The description of parcel was incorrect on the forwarding Letter & the seizure memo and Road Certificate.

37. Bhaskar Dutt has stated in the CoI that the buddy of Colonel reported for duty at 07:30 AM at the Officer's residence and had gone back to respective Lines at 12:00 PM and had returned for work at the Officer's residence at 04:30 PM, whereas the deceased was called at 01:30 PM on 01/07/2018 and was thereafter, murdered.



38. Reference has been made to Lalita Kumari vs. State of U.P., W.P.(Criminal) No.68/2008, wherein it has been observed that the registration of FIR is mandatory. Reliance is also placed on Kedar Turha vs. State of Bihar, Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 572/2016 Order of Hon'ble Patna High Court; Kashmeri Devi vs. Delhi Administration & Anr. AIR 1323, April, 1988 SCR (3) 700; and M. K. Kushalappa and Anr. vs. Sri K. K. George and Ors., Criminal Appeal No.1571- 1572/2021.

39. It is submitted that in the light of the aforesaid factors, it is evident that the State machinery did not even conduct the investigations. The Officers of Indian Army have gone to the extent of forging documents in the CoI.

40. A **Prayer** is therefore, made that Respondent No.3 / **Chief of Army Staff** be directed to place on record the investigation conducted by Military Police, all photographs, video recordings of crime scene and other places as a part of investigation, relevant camera/mobile phone used for this purpose, proceedings and finding of the Court of Inquiry conducted by the Indian Army and its approval by the competent authority if any; and direct **Delhi Police** to place before this Court the records of this case under its custody and the records of post mortem and viscera report; and also direct for a Court monitored investigation by constituting a multidisciplinary SIT headed by Central Bureau of Investigation; and further direct that the same be conducted in a time bound manner.

41. **Status Report has been filed by Respondent No.1 Delhi Police**, wherein all the details of the investigations carried out in the demise of Lance Naik Dinesh Phartiyal has been detailed. It has been submitted that final *Inquest Report under Section 174 Cr.P.C.* was prepared and forwarded



to SDM, Delhi Cantt., who has supported the Inquest Proceedings. The copy of Inquest Report has been annexed with the Status Report.

42. Status Report has also been filed by Union of India, wherein the case as stated in the Petition, has been reiterated. It has been further stated that considering the sensitivity of the matter, *Court of Inquiry* was constituted of Senior Officers of the Rank of Colonel as Presiding officer and two officers of Lieutenant Colonel/Major rank officers as Members. That Convening Authority issued written and unambiguous direction to apply Army Rule 180, if any nature of foul play is observed on the part of any personnel. Additionally, Convening Authority also directed to follow all the Rules and Guidelines for conducting Court of Inquiry.

43. The inquiry was conducted strictly as per the provisions of Army Act, 1950, Army Rules 1955 and Policies. 12 witnesses were examined including Petitioner and Mr. Deepankar Phartiyal (Brother of deceased). The Petitioner in her statement at the Court of Inquiry, stated that she has a talk with him on the day of the incident for 15 minutes and he seemed jovial. The Ld. Trial Court examined 11 documentary exhibits including Accidental Report, Post Mortem Report issued by Government Hospital.

44. After completion of investigation, Court of Inquiry deliberated on each issue and arrived at the conclusion based on reasoning supported by finding of investigation. *In the inquiry, it was concluded that 'no foul play emerged in the death of the individual.*

45. The Terminal benefits amounting to Rs.67,26,454/- have been processed by Kumaon Records, out of which Rs.58,70,194/- (approximately 87.68%) have been credited in the account of the Next of Kin.



46. It is stated that the contention of the Petitioner that death of her husband was not properly investigated, is baseless and without any corroborative value. Hence, it is submitted that the Petition be dismissed.

47. Copy of the opinion of the Court of Inquiry has been annexed along with the Status Report.

48. ***Rejoinder to the Status Reports of Delhi Police and Union of India has been filed***, wherein contents of the Petition have been reiterated.

Submission heard and record perused.

49. The Petition has been preferred by Lalita Phartiyal , who is the wife of the deceased Late Lance Naik Dinesh Phartiyal and concerns the suspicious death of Late L/Nk Dinesh Phartiyal, Army No. 4198416-Y, of the 16 Kumaon Regiment on 07.01.2018, when he was on temporary attachment as a “buddy” to Colonel Ajay Yadav (now retired) at his residence, 13, Church Road, Delhi Cantt-10.

50. The Police in the Inquest Report as well as Military Police in its independent CoI, concluded that the deceased committed suicide by hanging. The Petitioner vehemently contests the finding of suicide, claiming the death was a murder and that influential officials of the Indian Army are subverting the process of justice.

51. The Petitioner alleges a complete failure on the part of the Delhi Police to register an FIR and conduct a proper investigation. It further challenges the internal Court of Inquiry (CoI) conducted by the Indian Army as an “eye wash” intended to screen the offenders.

52. The Petitioner, who is wife of deceased, was but natural shaken up and suspected that it was a case of murder. The core of the Petitioner’s claim



rests on the belief that her husband, Late Lance Naik Dinesh Phartiyal, was murdered and did not commit suicide.

Forensic & Medical Evidence:

53. The Post-Mortem was conducted by Dr. Neeraj Kumar Garg of DDU Hospital. Although the initial PM temporarily kept the cause of death “pending till the receipt of FSL report of blood and viscera”, the subsequent and final opinion, issued on 04.07.2018, explicitly concluded that the **“cause of death was asphyxia as a result of hanging and manner of death is suicide”**. This final opinion was reached **after considering the FSL report**, thereby addressing the earlier requirement for pending information.

54. The forensic examination of the deceased’s viscera and blood samples definitively concluded that **“no any common poisons could be detected in the blood and viscera of deceased”**. This finding directly supports the conclusion that the death was caused by hanging and eliminates the possibility of poisoning, a common cause of foul play.

55. The external examination revealed a **ligature mark** on the neck, described as a groove, dry, parchment-like, and obliquely placed, consistent with hanging by a ligature material such as a bed sheet. The internal examination found no major internal injuries, with the hyoid bone, thyroid cartilage, and cricoid cartilage all found intact.

56. While the Petitioner argues that the body position suggests murder, the absence of violent injury and the presence of a ligature mark confirmed by a medical expert, gives rise to suspicion of foul play and creates a doubt about the **expert forensic conclusion of suicide**.

Inquest Report by Delhi Police:



57. The Petitioner's next contention is that no fair investigation was conducted and that the police prematurely closed the case as a suicide. However, the records establish that the matter was subject to both a civil police inquest under **Section 174 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Cr.P.C.)**, and a formal **Court of Inquiry (CoI)** by the Indian Army.

58. *An inquest* was conducted by ASI Bhopal Singh (No. 3198/SW). It involved visiting the place of occurrence i.e. 13 Church Road, seizing the ligature material i.e. bed sheet, arranging the post-mortem, and obtaining the FSL report.

59. The process culminated in the filing of the *Final Inquest Report*, concluding "death as a result of Hanging and manner of death is Suicide". The mere fact that the police did not register a First Information Report (FIR) **does not automatically imply a faulty inquiry**, as the inquest and subsequent expert opinions concluded that the death was non-homicidal in nature. The question of registration of FIR would have arisen only if some foul play emerged.

60. The argument that police were only involved in a limited role is insufficient to prove a conspiracy, given their primary function was to establish the cause of death *via* the Inquest procedure.

Military Investigations and Court of Enquiry:

61. *The CoI* was convened promptly on 20.01.2018 to investigate the circumstances of death and explicitly address the Petitioner's Complaints alleging murder. The CoI examined 12 witnesses, including the Petitioner, her brother, the Retd. Colonel and L/Nk Bhaskar Datt.

62. The CoI found "**no foul play involved in the death**" and concluded the death was not attributable to military service.



63. While the Petitioner alleges bias in the CoI's composition and process, the CoI proceedings clearly reflect an effort to counter-check allegations and did, in fact, identify a lapse regarding the **provision of two buddies to the officer**, noting this to be in contravention of Standing Orders. This acknowledgment of a lapse suggests the Inquiry was not an attempt at an "eye wash," as claimed.

64. Further, all the documents and the statement of the persons have been duly recorded.

65. Moreover, though the Petitioner relies heavily on the PAR, which states that "foul play can't be ruled out" and mandates a "detailed enquiry". However, the PAR itself was prepared while the **viscera reports and police investigation report were awaited**, suggesting its uncertainty, was prompted by incomplete information. The final post-mortem and FSL reports, subsequent to the PAR, superseded this interim uncertainty, by *concluding the death was a suicide due to hanging*.

66. Finally, the Apex Court has repeatedly held that an investigation should be transferred to the CBI only in "*exceptional circumstances where investigation done by the state does not inspire confidence*".

67. In this case, two Authorities have investigated the death and both concluded *it was suicide based on medical and forensic reports*. The Petitioner's mere suspicion or dissatisfaction with the conclusion is not an exceptional circumstance justifying the intervention of a CBI-led SIT.

68. There is not a single circumstance pointed out by the Petitioner, whereby a foul play is even *prima facie* suggested.



Conclusion:

69. In the light of two detailed Reports by two different independent Agencies, no further directions are required for constitution of SIT or a Court monitored investigation.

70. Needless to say, if the Petitioner has any grievance or considers that an FIR needs to be registered, she is at liberty to proceed in accordance with law.

71. There is no merit in the present Writ Petition, which along with pending Applications is hereby disposed of.

**(NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA)
JUDGE**

NOVEMBER 07, 2025/R