

CRM no.M-10577 of 2015 (O&M) 1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM no.M-10577 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 01.04.2015

Ramandeep Kaur

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

1)Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?

2) To be referred to the Reporters or not?

3) Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present : Mr.J.S.Lalli, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. P.S.Chauhan, Addl. AG, Haryana with
Mr. Himmat Singh, AAG, Haryana

MAHESH GROVER, J.

The petitioner prays for grant of protection as she apprehends threat to her life at the hands of her husband and his relatives as also her own relatives. She alleges maltreatment at her matrimonial home and her husband is undergoing psychiatric treatment.

Prima facie the Court is not inclined to interfere in the petition and grant the prayer made in the instant petition for the simple reason that the petitioner has ample remedies in law to protect herself and assert her rights in a dispute arising from a marital discord. However, the petitioner has repeatedly asserted before this Court that her life is under imminent danger at the hands of respondents no. 6 to 14. The Court then ascertained from the petitioner as to whether she is willing to re-compense the State in case the services of a police official are provided to her. She has stated that for one month she would be requiring such a protection and beyond that she

CRM no.M-10577 of 2015 (O&M) 2

would be managing her own affairs.

Upon consideration of the matter and noticing the peculiar facts mentioned in the petition, I deem it appropriate to direct the Superintendent of Police, Karnal to look into the grievance of the petitioner impassively and evaluate the threat perception to the petitioner. This order under any circumstances shall not be construed to be an acceptance of the allegations made by the petitioner against the respondents and the official respondents would do well in steering away from temptation to implicate the said respondents in a criminal offence as a knee-jerk reaction considering the fact that the dispute is essentially arising out of a marital discord where the tendency of a complaint to aggravate the allegations is almost an accepted norm.

In case respondent no.3 feels that there is a necessity to grant protection to the petitioner by providing the security then he may do so at the expenses of the petitioner as she has unequivocally stated before this Court that she would be willing to meet the expenses. Before the security is provided in the event of such a conclusion, the Superintendent of Police shall be at liberty to ask the petitioner to deposit the amount equivalent to the pay of a Constable for a period of one month.

Disposed of.

April 01, 2015
rekha

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE