



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition (Criminal) No.547 of 2025

09 October, 2025

Beena Rawat and Another

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and Others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Deepak Chandra, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. J.S. Virk, learned Deputy Advocate General along with Mr. Rakesh Joshi, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand.

Mr. Sandeep Adhikari, learned counsel for respondent no.5.

JUDGMENT: (per Mr. Subhash Upadhyay J.)

The petitioners have filed this writ petition with the following relief(s):-

"i. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of the Mandamus commanding and directing the respondent no.2 and 3 to provide adequate security to the petitioners as provided under the law by protecting their rights of life and personal liberty with dignity as guaranteed to them by the Constitution of India under Article 21, being a threat perception of life and liberty as against the respondent no.4, 5, 6 and 7.

ii. Issue any other or further writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

iii. To award the cost of the petition in favour of the petitioners."

2. The parties were directed to appear before the Mediation Centre on 19.09.2025 and report of the



Mediator reveals that the parties are not in a position to amicably settle their dispute.

3. The said report was placed before the Court on 24.09.2025 and the parties were directed to file their affidavits regarding assets and liabilities and the source of earning. Both the parties were also directed to be present before the Court.

4. Today, petitioner no.1-Beena Rawat (wife) and respondent no.5 Anand Singh (husband of petitioner no.1) are present before the Court.

5. Learned counsel for respondent no.5 submits that the affidavit, as required by the Hon'ble Court, has been filed and the petitioner has made an unjustified demand of ₹25 lakh as permanent alimony, which is beyond the financial capacity of respondent no.5 and further he is engaged at a Restaurant/ Dhaba in the State of Punjab and he earns only a sum of ₹8,000 to ₹9,000 per month. Respondent no.5 has ancestral land and the approximate market value of the said land may be around ₹5 lakh.

6. Contention of the petitioner regarding threats from respondent no.4, 5, 6 and 7 to the life and limb of the petitioner is misconceived as the petitioner is residing at Nainital whereas respondent nos.4, 6 and 7 are residing at Almora and respondent no.5 is on job in the



2025:UHC:9051-DB

State of Punjab. Thus, there is no threat perception to the petitioner from the respondents.

7. This Court interacted with respondent no.5 and owing to the fact that petitioner is having a minor child of ten years, respondent no.5 has agreed to pay a sum of ₹3,000/- per month to petitioner no.1 (wife). The accounts details have been provided by counsel for the petitioner no.1 and the same is taken on record.

8. Learned counsel for the respondents undertakes that respondent no.5 shall deposit a sum of ₹3,000/- per month in the account of respondent no.1.

9. With the above observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

10. There shall be no order as costs.

(G. NARENDAR, C. J.)

(SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.)

Dated: 09.10.2025

ss