**OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, DELHI.**

No.20 /PRO/PHQ dated Delhi, the 08/01/2013

To

The Editor,
The Times of India,
New Delhi.

Subject : **Rejoinder to the news-item captioned "Tujhe kahin ka nahin chhorunga".**

Sir,

Apropos the news item captioned "***Tujhe kahin ka nahin chhorunga***" by Ms Priyanka Singh that appeared in the Sunday edition of 'Times of India' on 06.01.2013.

The facts which have come to light on an internal enquiry are that the reporter made two calls (not three as reported) to the Police Control Room from her mobile phone number-----. She has reported in the news item that she was asked to contact telephone number 27854799 when her first call to the PCR materialized. However, this is not true. When she made the second call to PCR at 1745 hours she insisted on knowing what action had been taken on the first call. The recording of her conversation with the PCR operator, which is preserved in the PCR, as a matter of our Standard Operating Procedure, is reproduced below:-

"***Bhaiya actually main chahti hun, ki is par kya action ho rha hain, kyonki main aam nagrik to hun hi, Aap ko to pata hi chal raha hoga, lekin main ek journalist bhi hun, aur is par action nahi hua to front page par story aayegi"***

*(Actually I want to know what action is being taken. Since I am not only an ordinary citizen but (as you can understand), I am a journalist too, so if action is not taken, 'A front page story will come')*

As per the Standard Operating Procedure, a PCR Van is expected to respond to distress calls by reaching the scene of occurrence immediately. In this case too, the PCR Van (L-68) reached the scene of occurrence at 1803 hours. The PCR Van Incharge HC Santosh Kumar did call Ms. Priyanka Singh from his personal mobile phone number 9868066307 at 1758 hrs and talked to her for 124 seconds (as per Call Data Record of MTNL). At 1803 hours on 03.01.2013, HC Santosh Kumar informed the PCR Control Room that he had reached the scene of occurrence but Ms. Priyanka Singh had left by then.

It has been stated in the news-item that she dialed 100 again and the voice at the other end informed her that police from Badli jurisdiction would take action in this matter. However, the facts are that the second call from the lady (-----) was received at the PCR at 1745 hours on 03.01.2013. The call was received by Lady Ct. Parvesh handling channel number 135 of the

Police Control Room. As per the recording, the caller (Ms. Priyanka Singh) referred to the earlier call made at 1740 hours. On this, the PCR operator lady Ct. Parvesh informed her that the local police had been informed about the PCR call received and, therefore, she could get in touch with PS Badli on phone no- 27854799, as per the Standard Operating Procedure, for suitable follow- up action.

The caller argued that when 100 number is provided, why should she approach the local police station. The lady constable explained to her that her complaint had been forwarded to PS Badli for taking legal action. However, if she needed police help, more PCR vans could be sent. Lady Ct. Parvesh further offered to send a PCR van to wherever she (Ms. Priyanka Singh) was, to give further details. However, the reporter replied that she had already left the spot and the auto driver may also have left by that time. When the reporter did not accept the offer to get further police assistance and only wanted to know the status of the action taken on her report, the PCR lady operator requested her to get in touch with PS Samaipur Badli on phone no. 27854799. Our recording shows that the PCR lady operator offered to send more PCR vans repeatedly (three times) but your reporter did not show any interest in accepting the offer.

It has been reported in the news-item that she waited for some time and called up PCR on 100 to verify the auto-

rickshaw registration number. She received a call from a PCR van after 30 minutes. She requested the police officer to register a complaint but the officer said that he could register an FIR only after the TSR driver was challaned. However, as per our records, there was no third call by Ms. Priyanka Singh to the PCR. In response to the first and second call to the PCR recorded at 1740 and 1745 hours, our operator's call and voice records show that the first call finished at 1744 hours and second at 1747 hours respectively and the following message was transmitted to PCR van (L-68) electronically at 1748 hours :-

"***Badli marg par ek auto No. DL 1RM 9979 wala meter se nahin jar raha hai aur kahne par hamari photo khich lia hai or dhamki de rha hai. Need police.***"

The van reached the spot at **1753 hrs** i.e. within 5 minutes of receiving the call. At **1803 hrs**, i.e. within 15 minutes of receiving the call, the Incharge of PCR Van HC Santosh Kumar reported the following to the Command Room of PCR.

***" Reached in 5 min., caller ne phone par bataya ki Auto Wale se kaha suni thi jo mouke se ja chuki hoon".***

HC Santosh informed that neither the vehicle of the given number nor the caller was found at the spot. HC Santosh called Ms

Priyanka Singh from his personal mobile No. (9868066307) at **1758 hrs**. (i.e. within 10 min. of receiving the call) and spoke to her for 2 minutes (CDR enclosed). During this conversation Ms Priyanka Singh said-

***"I am Priyanka working in Times of India. One Auto Rickshaw driver at Badli crossing refused to go on meter rate. There was an argument and TSR driver clicked my photo. I have left the Badli crossing (spot)."***

Hence, it has been wrongly reported that only after 30 minutes your reporter got a reply from the PCR van. In fact, the PCR van in charge HC Santosh spoke to her from the spot to know her location by calling her at her mobile No. at 1758 hrs, which was within 10 minutes of receiving the PCR Call.

It is also wrongly reported that the police officer said that an FIR will be registered only after the TSR driver is challaned.

Ms Priyanka Singh instead of coming back to the spot and registering her complaint, asked the officials to locate the auto rickshaw from the registration number given by her.

The accused TSR driver Beeru Singh was traced and during interrogation revealed that he was asked to carry 4

passengers by Ms Priyanka Singh. When he refused to do so, Ms Priyanka Singh clicked his photo from her mobile and threatened to put his photo on a website for action against him. In order to save himself, he also took photographs of the 4 ladies insisting on boarding the TSR together. The mobile of the accused TSR driver has been seized and is being forensically examined. He also denied having said that *" Agar police ko complaint ki to tumhe kahin ka nahi chhorunga"*

Ms Priyanka Singh has nowhere mentioned during the 2 PCR calls that the TSR driver had said that "Tumhe kahin ka nahi chorunga" (Voice recordings of 2 PCR calls enclosed)

Further, it was improper on the part of Ms Priyanka Singh to insist upon the TSR driver to carry more than three passengers, which is an act punishable u/s 66/192A of MV Act & Delhi Motor Vehicle Rule for violation of permit conditions of a Public Service Vehicle (PSV).

In the PCR call at 1740 hrs Ms Priyanka Singh specifically said that 4 sisters (including her) wanted to book the auto rickshaw.

It is further alleged in the news item that phone number 27854799 of PS Samaipur Badi was called by the reporter several times but it kept ringing without any response

from the other side. The fact of the matter is that the PCR Command Room passed the contents of the first message to District Control Room of Outer District which in turn passed it to HC Chander Singh, the Duty Officer of PS Samaipur Badli. In response to this, the Emergency Officer of PS SP Badli ASI Balbir Singh left the PS vide Daily Diary No. 74-B at 1754 hours and reached the spot at 1803 hours. He reported that no vehicle of the above description was found at the spot. The caller was not available. He attempted to contact Ms. Priyanka Singh from landline no. 27854799 but after several attempts, the caller could not be contacted.

**As the vehicle number was not available in Traffic Police Database, the details of the same were obtained by sending a team from P.S. S.P. Badli to the Transport Authority. On the basis of the address obtained from the Transport Authority database, the driver of the vehicle namely Biru Singh, age-32 yrs, r/o Mukundpur, PS Bhalswa Dairy was traced and arrested. A case FIR No-06/13, PS Badli u/s 506/509 IPC has been registered. His cell phone has been seized.**

It has been further alleged that the lady reporter received a call from a traffic police officer at 8.30 PM who said that though the TSR was not registered, they were still trying to trace him. When she tried to revert to the traffic police officer on

the same number, the phone kept on ringing. As alleged, this was the last call that she received from the police. However, the facts are that the PCR had passed the information pertaining to the TSR driver to the Traffic Control Room which in turn had passed it on to Rohini and Bawana Traffic Circles. The Duty Officer of Rohini Circle Ct. Mannu alerted the motor-cycle staff who also tried to get the ownership details from the 'Traffic Computer Cell' but they were not available on the data-base. He then spoke to the caller on her mobile phone and informed her that in the absence of the details of the TSR he was unable to take immediate action but as soon as the TSR is located, action would be taken.

The traffic police of Rohini Circle subsequently prosecuted the driver of the TSR u/s 66/192A MV Act (Permit Violation), 11.9 DMVR/177 MV Act (Refusal to take commuter to destination) and u/s 11.3 DMVR/177 MV Act (Misbehavior) and the vehicle was impounded.

As can be seen from the above, not only was the TSR prosecuted under relevant sections of the Motor Vehicle Act but a case under Indian Penal Code was also registered and the TSR driver namely Biru Singh was arrested and his cell phone seized.

It is unfortunate that despite adequate action having been taken by the police, your reporter filed this story misrepresenting facts. It is equally regrettable that you chose to

project it as banner headlines on the front page of your esteemed daily.

It is reiterated that your reporter, at no stage, conveyed to the police that she had been intimidated by the TSR driver saying *"Tujhe kahin ka nahin chhorunga"*.

It is requested that our rejoinder may be published as prominently as the news report and the reporter should be cautioned not to file stories based on incorrect facts. It is only proper that your readers get to know the correct facts related to this matter.

Yours faithfully,

(**Rajan Bhagat**)
Public Relation Officer,
Delhi Police, Delhi.