



\$~

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

*Reserved on: 21st March, 2025**Date of Decision: 03rd July, 2025*

+ CRL.M.C. 1916/2025

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. L.M. Grover, Adv. (Through VC)

versus

STATE (NCT) OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC (CRL)
with Mr. Alok Sharma and Ms.
Jyotsana Pandit, Advs.
SI Awant PS Janakpuri
Mr. Roshan Lal Saini, Adv. for R-2 to
R-6 (Through VC)

CORAM:**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA**

%

J U D G M E N T**MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J:**

1. This petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1908 ('CrPC') for quashing of the following order(s):

- (i) order dated 02.02.2023 passed by LD. M.M., Mahila Court-05, South-west District, Dwarka Courts, Delhi in the case no. MC 833/2022 titled ('Trial Court');



- (ii) order dated 10.07.2023 passed by LD. ASJ-02, South-west District, New Delhi in the case titled as [REDACTED] v. State & Ors.' bearing C.A. No. 158/2023 ('Appellate Court') upholding the Trial Court's order dated 02.02.2023.

1.1. In addition, the Petitioner seeks directions to the Trial Court to summon Respondent nos. 3 to 6 to face the proceedings filed under the provisions of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 ('DV act') by the Petitioner.

2. This petition was initially numbered as W.P.(CRL.) 200/2024, however, vide order dated 11.03.2025, the petition was converted into a CRL.(M.C.) and treated as a petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

3. Facts relevant to adjudicate the present matters are as under: -

3.1. It is stated that Petitioner has filed an application/complaint under section 12 of the DV act before the Trial Court against her husband [Respondent no. 2], parents-in-law [Respondent nos. 3 & 4] and her brother-in-law and his wife [Respondent no. 5 & 6] seeking the following reliefs:

- a. To pass protection order under Section 18 of the DV act by restraining the Respondents from committing any act of domestic violence.
- b. **To pass residence orders under Section 19 of the DV act by directing the respondents to provide alternate accommodation**
- c. To pass the monetary relief under section 20 of the DV act by directing Respondent/husband to pay the minimum amount of Rs. 30.000/- per month
- d. To pass compensation order under section 22 of the DV act by directing the Respondents to pay the aggrieved a sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- on account of mental torture and agony.

Facts alleged in the complaint

3.2. It is stated that the marriage between the Petitioner and Respondent no. 2/husband was solemnized on 01.12.2001 and the expenses of the marriage



were borne by the parents of the Petitioner and a lot of gifts as demanded by Respondent nos. 2 to 6 were as well given by the parents of the Petitioner/complainant.

3.3. It is alleged in the complaint that, after the marriage, from the very next day the Petitioner was subjected to various kind of cruelties by the Respondent nos. 3 & 4/parents-in-law.

3.4. It is alleged in the complaint that till 2004 whenever Petitioner used to touch feet of Respondent no. 4/father-in-law, he used abusive words against her and Respondent no.3/mother-in-law used to make fun of Petitioner's physical appearance.

3.5. It is alleged in the complaint that during the Petitioner's pregnancy, the Petitioner had requested Respondent nos. 2-6 for installation of air conditioner ('AC') in the house, however, not only this request was denied but Respondent No. 3/mother-in-law ill-treated the Petitioner by taunting and passing insulting comments.

3.6. It is alleged that on 15.09.2003, when Petitioner gave birth to a female child, the Respondent nos. 2 to 6 had not only shown resentment; but during the *chola* ceremony of child, the Petitioner was insulted by the Respondent nos. 2 to 6 due to non-fulfilment of demands; and thereafter Respondent no.2 refused to sit in the *hawan* of his daughter and the Petitioner had to perform the *pooja* alone.

3.7. It is alleged that Respondent no. 3/mother-in-law used to not only pass unwarranted remarks but she deprived the Petitioner of her basic needs and did not allow the Petitioner to get some money from the earnings of her husband i.e. Respondent no.2.



3.8. It is stated that in the year 2013 the Petitioner and Respondent no. 2 to 6 shifted to a newly purchased house in East Azad Nagar consisting of Ground floor, First floor and Second Floor ['East Azad Nagar property']. It is stated that Petitioner along with Respondent no.2 was residing at the Second Floor of East Azad Nagar property. It is stated at that time Petitioner was also forced by the Respondent nos. 2 to 6 to sell her gold bangles.

3.9. It is alleged that even after meeting all their demands, the behavior of Respondent nos. 2 to 6 never changed and the use of abusive words against the Petitioner and her parents became a routine activity.

3.10. It is alleged that on 15.06.2014 Respondent no. 2/husband had slapped the complainant in front of Respondent nos. 3 to 6 and instead of stopping him/husband; Respondent no.3/mother-in-law stated that Petitioner deserved that slap.

3.11. It is alleged that, in 2017, during the gall bladder surgery of Petitioner neither Respondent no. 2 nor Respondent nos. 3 to 5 helped her.

3.12. It is stated that in 2015-2016 a one BHK house [situated nearby to the East Azad Nagar property, in the same street] was purchased in the name of complainant/Petitioner and Respondent no.6 [i.e. Smt. Amita Gandhi] by Respondent nos. 2 to 5. It is stated that on 24.08.2020 the Petitioner along with the Respondent no. 2/husband shifted to the said one BHK house and resided there until 02.10.2021. It is alleged that even then Respondent no. 3/mother-in-law used to instigate her son [Respondent no. 2] against the Petitioner and her daughter.

3.13. It is stated that since the Petitioner was unable to bear any further abuses of Respondent nos. 2 to 6 and the aforesaid acts amounted to domestic



violence, therefore, aggrieved by the said acts the Petitioner in November, 2022 filed the complaint under the DV Act.

Impugned orders

4. The Trial Court upon hearing the arguments and after perusing the complaint on the issue of summoning Respondent nos. 3 to 6, vide impugned order dated 02.02.2023 held that there was no domestic relationship between Petitioner and Respondent nos. 3 to 6 and accordingly the Trial Court deleted them from the array of parties.

5. The Trial Court observed that the Petitioner along with Respondent No. 2 was admittedly residing in a separate property and had established a separate household. The Trial Court, therefore, concluded that there was no domestic relationship between the Petitioner and Respondent Nos. 3 to 6.

6. Thereafter, the Petitioner filed an appeal under Section 29 of the DV act against the order dated 02.02.2023 wherein the Appellate Court dismissed the appeal and affirmed the view taken by the Trial Court in deleting Respondent nos. 3 to 6 from the array of parties.

Arguments of the Petitioner

7. Learned counsel for the Petitioner stated that the Trial Court and the Appellate Court failed to take into consideration the allegations levelled by the Petitioner against Respondent nos. 3 to 6 in the complaint since the said acts complained of constitute domestic violence.

7.1. He stated that Respondent nos. 3 to 6 are covered within the definition of *respondent* under section 2 (q) of the DV act.

7.2. He stated that the mere fact that Respondent nos. 3 to 6 had been living separately from Petitioner since 2013 would not absolve them from the acts of domestic violence.



7.3. He relied upon the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in **Prabha Tyagi vs. Kamlesh Devi**¹ to contend that even if the married couple sets up a separate residence, then, as well the complaint under DV Act can be filed against the *respondent(s)* who were previously residing in the same shared household.

7.4. He stated that Respondent no. 2 has failed to maintain his daughter as well due to which she was constrained to file petition under section 20 (3) of the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956, which is pending before court of Family Court-02, Southwest District, Dwarka District Court, Delhi ('Family Court').

7.5. He stated that Trial Court and the Appellate Court failed to consider the specific allegations made against Respondent nos. 3 to 6 in the complaint, which establishes a domestic relationship with the Petitioner, therefore, Respondent nos. 3 to 6 ought to have been summoned and not deleted from the array of the parties.

Arguments of the Respondent nos. 2 to 6

8. Leaned counsel for Respondent nos. 3 to 6 stated that the allegations made by the Petitioner in the complaint are false and frivolous and in the facts of this case the Trial Court has rightly deleted Respondent nos. 3 to 6 from the array of the parties.

8.1. He stated that the Respondent No. 4 [Father-in-law, Late Kishore Gandhi] had died on 10.02.2024. Further Respondent No. 3 [Mother-in-law, Mrs. Manju Gandhi] is on death bed. And Respondent No. 5 and 6 [brother-in-law and his wife] never lived with Petitioner or Respondent No.2 [Sumit

¹ (2022) 8 SCC 90 at para 60



Gandhi i.e. husband] and had separate floor with separate kitchen from the very beginning, therefore, since the Petitioner and Respondent No.2 were residing separately and established a separate household, thus, the said Respondent nos. 3 to 6 cannot be said to have a domestic relationship as per the DV act.

8.2. He stated that there are two concurrent decisions of the Trial Court and Appellate Court. He stated that no perversity, arbitrariness or abuse of legal process has been demonstrated by the Petitioner herein for this Court to exercise its inherent power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

8.3. He stated that presently in compliance of the order dated 08.12.2023 passed by the Family Court, Respondent no. 2/husband, is paying Rs. 20,000/- per month as ad-interim maintenance, though, the final amount which shall be payable would not even be Rs.8000/- per month considering the income/expenditure of Respondent no. 2.

8.4. He stated that Respondent nos. 5 and 6 have no concern with the Petitioner and Respondent no. 2 and no specific allegations appear in the complaint against Respondent nos. 5 and 6.

Findings and Analysis

9. This Court has heard the submissions of the parties and perused the record.

10. In view of the death of Respondent No. 4 on 10.02.2024, the relief sought in the present petition does not survive qua Respondent No. 4. As a matter of fact, the Petitioner did not file any application to bring this fact on record and therefore, this petition even otherwise has been abated qua Respondent No. 4.



11. The Appellate Court vide impugned order dated 10.07.2023 recorded the following reasons for upholding the decision passed by the Trial Court in regard to non-summoning and deletion of Respondent Nos. 3 to 6:-

“15. None of the reliefs sought by the appellant is directed against the respondent no. 3 to 6 except for restraining them from committing domestic violence and claiming compensation from them.

16. From the pleadings of appellant it is evident that she is residing separately from respondents no. 3 to 6 since 2013 and after 2020 she has even shifted to some other place. Relief sought by the appellant is not in respect of shared household rather appellant has restricted her claim to an alternate accommodation therefore, in my humble view case law relied by appellant as settled in “**Prabha Tyagi Vs. Kamlesh Devi**” (Supra) is not applicable to facts of case.

.....

18. As held in the above stated judgment, the relatives of the husband should not be roped in on the basis of omnibus allegations unless specific instances of their involvement in the crime is made out.

19. In the present case, allegations made in the complaint are mostly directed against husband of appellant. It is evident that since 2013, appellant started residing separately with her husband (respondent no. 2) and they have established separate household. No specific allegation is appearing in the complaint against respondents no. 5 & 6. No complaint has been made by appellant against respondents no. 3 to 6 during twenty one years of matrimonial life and since respondents no. 3 to 6 are residing separately there is no threat to appellant for any kind of domestic violence from them. Hence, Ld. Trial Court has taken a right view in deleting respondents no. 3 to 6 from the array of parties.”

(Emphasis supplied)

12. Impugned order(s) have been challenged by the Petitioner on the ground that there was a domestic relationship in the past between Petitioner and Respondent nos. 3 to 6, since she resided with them in a shared household



until 2013 and Respondent nos. 3 to 6 used to inflict domestic violence upon her by provoking husband/Respondent No.2 or by failing to stop him.

13. Before advertng to the facts of the present case it would be imperative to record the scope of interference under Section 482 CrPC. The scope of the inherent jurisdiction of the High Court is to prevent abuse of the process of Court and to secure the ends of justice. It is trite law that such inherent power is to be exercised sparingly and not upon a re-appreciation of materials which have already been considered by the Trial Court and Appellate Court. (Re: **State of A.P. v. Golconda Linga Swamy**²; **Chilakamarthi Venkateswarlu v. State of Andhra Pradesh**³ and **Bharti Anand v. Sushant Anand and Others**⁴).

14. A perusal of the complaint dated 11.11.2022 shows that the allegations of harassment and violence enlisting specific incidents have been made substantially against Respondent no. 2/husband.

Although the complaint contains allegations of *taunts* and demands for gifts against Respondent nos. 3 and 4 (who is since deceased), however, as far as the living arrangement is concerned it is the admitted case of the complainant herself that she had established a separate household with Respondent No.2 and has been residing in a distinct floor in the East Azad Nagar property since 2013 separate from Respondent nos. 3 to 6. The Petitioner also admits that in fact after 2020 she has even shifted out to a separate flat in a distinct building with Respondent no. 2/husband in a separate household.

² (2004) 6 SCC 522 [paragraphs 5 to 7]

³ (2020) 17 SCC 595 [paragraphs 12 to 15]

⁴ 2022 SCC OnLine Del 1191 [paragraph 8]



Furthermore, in the complaint there are no specific dates given by the Petitioner against the alleged acts of Respondent No. 5 [brother-in-law] neither there is any specific incident pleaded in the complaint against Respondent No. 6 [the wife of the brother-in-law]. Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 were admittedly living in a separate household on a distinct floor of the East Azad Nagar property since 2013. Moreover, the Appellate Court observed that Petitioner was not seeking any relief of residence in the shared household with either Respondent No. 3 or Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.

It is in this factual matrix, after examining the reliefs sought in the complaint, Appellate Court reached to the conclusion that there is no domestic relationship between the Petitioner and Respondent Nos. 3 to 6; and the Trial Court as well as Appellate Court directed deletion of Respondent Nos. 3 to 6.

15. It is relevant to note that in the facts of this case, the complaint alleging domestic violence has been filed after 21 years of marriage and after 9 years since Petitioner last resided with Respondent Nos. 3, 5 and 6.

The marriage was solemnized in 2001 and the complaint has been filed in 2022 (i.e., after 21 years). The earliest date of incident of alleged domestic violence is of 2001 and the last allegation of incident of alleged domestic violence against Respondent Nos. 3 is of the year 2020 and for Respondent No. 5 is of 2017. These allegations in addition to being stale appear to have been made with an intent to rope in the relatives to exert pressure on Respondent No. 2/husband to provide Petitioner and her daughter with maintenance and alternate residence.



16. In the complaint there are bald allegations that Respondent nos. 3 to 6 demanded gifts; however, there are no specific averments in the complaint qua the said demands vis-à-vis the deleted Respondents.

17. It would be relevant to refer to a recent judgment passed by the Supreme Court in **Geddani Jhansi v. State of Telangana**⁵ wherein the Supreme Court has observed that Courts must exercise caution and be judicious in entertaining criminal proceedings arising out of domestic disputes against *relatives* and observed that such proceedings should only be entertained when specific allegations are made with credible material to support the same. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under:

“31. Invoking criminal process is a serious matter with penal consequences involving coercive measures, which can be permitted only when specific act(s) which constitute offences punishable under the Penal Code or any other penal statute are alleged or attributed to the accused and a *prima facie* case is made out. It applies with equal force when criminal laws are invoked in domestic disputes. Criminalising domestic disputes without specific allegations and credible materials to support the same may have disastrous consequences for the institution of family, which is built on the premise of love, affection, cordiality and mutual trust. Institution of family constitutes the core of human society. Domestic relationships, such as those between family members, are guided by deeply ingrained social values and cultural expectations. These relationships are often viewed as sacred, demanding a higher level of respect, commitment, and emotional investment compared to other social or professional associations. For the aforesaid reason, preservation of family relationship has always been emphasised upon. **Thus, when family relationships are sought to be brought within the ambit of criminal proceedings rupturing the family bond, courts should be circumspect and judicious, and should allow invocation of criminal process only when there are specific allegations with supporting materials which clearly constitute criminal offences.**

32. We have to keep in mind that **in the context of matrimonial disputes, emotions run high, and as such in the complaints filed alleging harassment or domestic violence, there may be a tendency to implicate other members of the family who do not come to the rescue of the complainant or remain mute spectators to any alleged incident of harassment, which in our view**

⁵ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 263



cannot by itself constitute a criminal act without there being specific acts attributed to them. Further, when tempers run high and relationships turn bitter, there is also a propensity to exaggerate the allegations, which does not necessarily mean that such domestic disputes should be given the colour of criminality.

33. It goes without saying that genuine cases of cruelty and violence in domestic sphere, which do happen, ought to be handled with utmost sensitivity. Domestic violence typically happens within the four walls of the house and not in the public gaze. Therefore, such violence is not noticed by public at large, except perhaps by the immediate neighbours. Thus, providing visible evidence by the victim of domestic violence may not be easily forthcoming and producing direct evidence may be hard and arduous, which does not necessarily mean that domestic violence does not occur. In fact, to deal with this pernicious phenomenon, stringent statutes like Protection from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, have been enacted with very expansive meaning and scope of what amounts to domestic violence. **Since, violence perpetrated within the domestic sphere by close relatives is now criminalised entailing serious consequences on the perpetrators, the courts have to be careful while dealing with such cases by examining whether there are specific allegations with instances against the perpetrators and not generalised allegations. The purpose and mandate of the law to protect the victims of domestic violence is of paramount importance, and as such, a balance has to be struck by ensuring that while perpetrators are brought to book, all the family members or relatives are not indiscriminately brought within the criminal net in a sweeping manner.**

.....

35. We are, thus, of the view that in criminal cases relating to domestic violence, the complaints and charges should be specific, as far as possible, as against each and every member of the family who are accused of such offences and sought to be prosecuted, as otherwise, it may amount to misuse of the stringent criminal process by indiscriminately dragging all the members of the family. There may be situations where some of the family members or relatives may turn a blind eye to the violence or harassment perpetrated to the victim, and may not extend any helping hand to the victim, which does not necessarily mean that they are also perpetrators of domestic violence, unless the circumstances clearly indicate their involvement and instigation. **Hence, implicating all such relatives without making specific allegations and attributing offending acts to them and proceeding against them without *prima facie* evidence that they were complicit and had actively collaborated with the perpetrators of domestic violence, would amount to abuse of the process of law.”**

(Emphasis supplied)



18. The Trial Court and the Appellate Court after examining the allegations in the complaint against the alleged acts of Respondent Nos. 3, 5 and 6, who lived separately from the Petitioner since 2013, have held that the said allegations fail to justify initiation of criminal proceedings against them.

19. In the complaint, the Petitioner has alleged that Respondent No. 3 used to persistently level *taunts* at her since early days of the marriage. In this regard, it would be relevant to refer the recent decision of Supreme Court in **Kamal & Ors. vs. State of Gujarat**⁶, wherein while quashing an FIR filed under Section 498-A IPC, the Court held that such allegations of *taunts* cannot justify initiation of criminal proceedings against the relatives including parent-in-laws in a matrimonial discord. The relevant paragraphs of the judgment read as under:-

“11. What is important, for the purposes of deciding this case, is that in the FIR there is no specific allegation of demand of dowry by the accused. Further, the allegation of harassment of the complainant at the instance of the parents in law is limited to extending taunts and custody related issues of minor children. However, there is no disclosure about the nature of those taunts. Admittedly, the second respondent was married to the first appellant in the year 2005 and for last several years since before lodging the FIR, the complainant had been working and staying in rented accommodations at different places. Besides that, the FIR was lodged on 20.07.2019, just three days after service of summons of the divorce proceedings initiated by the first appellant. In these circumstances, we will have to consider whether the impugned proceedings are vexatious and mala fide, particularly in the context of a matrimonial dispute where time and again Courts have been cautioned to be circumspect to obviate malicious prosecution of family members of the main accused.

12. Even if we assume that there are some allegations of assault and of physical and mental torture of the complainant, but they are against the husband. As against the parents in law, the allegations are only of extending taunts and of not parting with the money for managing

⁶ 2025 INSC 504



household expenses. Specific details in respect of those taunts have not been disclosed. Moreover, a few taunts here and there is a part of everyday life which for happiness of the family are usually ignored. Interestingly, as per own allegations in the FIR, the complainant admits that when she reported those issues to her parents and uncle, she was counselled to bear patience. In the circumstances, in our considered view, no case to proceed against the parents in law, namely, the second and third appellant is made out. In so far as the first appellant is concerned, there are allegations of physical and mental torture of the complainant at his behest. Consequently, the case may proceed qua the first appellant.

13. Before parting, we would like to observe that the High adopted an extremely pedantic approach while dealing with the quashing petition of the appellants. No doubt, in ordinary course, while exercising power under Section 482 of the CrPC, the Court is not required to test the correctness of the allegations, but in matters arising from matrimonial disputes, particularly where the allegations are levelled after many years of marriage and, that too, after one party initiates divorce proceeding against the other, the Court must be circumspect in taking the allegations at their face value. Rather, it must examine, where allegations of mala fides are there, whether those allegations have been levelled with an oblique purpose. More so, while considering the prayer of the relatives of the husband.”

(Emphasis supplied)

Applying the law laid down in the aforesaid judgment, the order of the Trial Court and the Appellate Court deleting Respondent No. 3 from the array of the parties is justified. Moreover, the submission of the Respondent nos. 2 to 6 that Respondent No. 3 is on her death bed has also not been contested during arguments. Therefore, in these facts, the order of the Trial court and Appellate Court in declining to initiate criminal proceedings against Respondent No. 3 does not merit interference.

20. There are no specific incidents of domestic violence against Respondent No. 6 in the complaint. Respondent No. 6 has been residing in a



separate household since 2013. Thus, keeping in view the judgments of the Supreme Court in **Geddami Jhansi** (supra) as well as **Kamal v. State of Gujarat** (supra), the order of the Trial Court and the Appellate Court deleting Respondent No. 6 from the array of parties does not merit any interference.

21. The specific incidents qua Respondent Nos. 3 and 5 averred in the complaint fail to justify initiating criminal proceedings against Respondent Nos. 3 and 5. So also the unspecific allegations against Respondent No. 6 in the complaint does not justify initiation of specific proceedings. As observed by Supreme Court in **Geddami Jhansi** (supra) the criminal process in domestic violence disputes ought not to be initiated lightly.

22. The Petitioner while not disputing that she has set up a separate household with Respondent No. 2 since 2013, has relied upon the judgment of Supreme Court in **Prabha Tyagi vs. Kamlesh Devi** (supra) to maintain the complaint against Respondent Nos. 3, 5 and 6. Admittedly, in the complaint, the Petitioner is not seeking enforcement of right of residence in the shared household with Respondent Nos. 3, 5 and 6. The Supreme Court in **Prabha Tyagi vs. Kamlesh Devi** (supra) adjudicated upon the identity of the respondent against whom a complainant can enforce her right to reside in the shared household. In this context, the Supreme Court held that such a right can also be enforced by a complainant against a person/respondent with whom she had resided in the past or a person/respondent against whom she can enforce the right to live in a shared household.

However, in the subject complaint, Petitioner herein has prayed for a direction to Respondent nos. 2 to 6 to provide her and her daughter an 'alternate residence' in the same neighbourhood; and the said right is being



perused against Respondent No. 2/husband. The Petitioner in this complaint is not seeking to enforce her right to reside in the shared household with either Respondent No. 3 or Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.

Respondent No. 3 has a separate household. Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 have a separate household. Petitioner along with Respondent No. 2 has a separate household. However, as noted above the Petitioner is not seeking to enforce her right to reside in the shared household with either Respondent No. 3 or Respondent Nos. 5 and 6. Thus, the reliance placed on the judgment of **Prabha Tyagi vs. Kamlesh Devi** (supra) by the Petitioner is misplaced.

23. Pertinently, the Appellate Court after perusing the averments in the complaint held that since Petitioner and Respondent Nos. 3 to 6 are residing separately, there was no present and continuing threat of domestic violence. This finding of the Appellate Court is not disputed by the Petitioner during the course of arguments and in the opinion of this Court, this is a relevant consideration justifying non-issuance of summons to Respondent Nos. 3 to 6.

24. In the facts of this case, the Petitioner has failed to show any infirmity in the impugned orders. The specific incidents pleaded in the complaint against Respondent No. 2 has already resulted in initiation of criminal proceedings against him and the reliefs sought in the complaint are being pursued against Respondent No. 2/husband and being heard by the Trial Court. Thus, the impugned orders deleting Respondent Nos. 3, 5 and 6 requires no interference and the proceedings qua Respondent No. 4 have already abated as noted above.

25. In view of the above, the petition is accordingly dismissed along with the pending applications, if any. No order as to cost.



**MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA
(JUDGE)**

JULY 03, 2025/rhc/MS