VERDICTUM.IN

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(CRL) 1987/2025

THOPPANI SANJEEV RAO .....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kanika Saini, Ms. Puneet Kumari, Mr. Prem Latha, Ms. Divya Mathur, Advocates with Petitioner in person

versus

NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION & ORS. & ORS.
.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anupam S. Sharrma, SPP for CBI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

O R D E R

% 14.10.2025

1. The Petitioner had made a representation on 23rd January, 2025, to Respondents No. 1, 2 and 3. In response Respondent No. 1 (National Human Rights Commission of India[1]) registered Case No. 243/1/40/2025 and by order dated 27th March, 2025, directed Respondent No. 3 to take necessary action within a period of four weeks. The grievance of the Petitioner is that, despite the aforenoted directions, no action has been taken.

2. In the above circumstances, the Petitioner seeks the following reliefs:

> *"A. Pass an Order directing the Respondent No.1 or Respondent No.2 to investigate/inquire in the petitioner complaint dated 21.01.2025 registered as Case No.- 243/1/40/2025 by R-1.*
> *B. Pass an order farming guidelines, that Police station shall treat*

[1] "NHRC/the Commission"

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 27/10/2025 at 17:46:46

VERDICTUM.IN

women Respectfully and no unparliamentary language shall be used by Police officials in specific with any women.
C. Pass any other which this Hon'ble Court May deem fit to the facts and circumstances of the case."

3. Insofar as the prayer seeking directions to Respondent No. 1 is concerned, the Petitioner states that, in the event of non-compliance with the earlier directions, the Commission possesses *suo motu* powers to inquire into the matter. For this purpose, it is open to the Petitioner to invoke the jurisdiction of the Commission by filing an appropriate representation/application seeking necessary directions.

4. With respect to Prayer B, the Court finds no reason to frame any such guidelines. It is beyond dispute that police officials are expected to treat women with dignity and must refrain from using inappropriate or unparliamentary language. Hence, the prayer sought is misconceived.

5. With the above observations, the present petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2025/ab

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 27/10/2025 at 17:46:46