

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

CRM-M No.11378 of 2015.

Date of Decision: July 09, 2015.

Radha

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR.

Present: Mr. Hardeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SNEH PRASHAR, J.

A petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short, “Cr.P.C.”) was filed by the petitioner seeking protection of her life and liberty apprehending threat at the hands of respondents No.4 to 9 and for direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to look into the grievance of the petitioner and take appropriate action against respondents No.4 to 9.

Reply in the form of affidavit of Vivek S. Soni, IPS, Assistant Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Adampur, District Jalandhar (Rural) on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 has been filed. It is mentioned in the reply that the petitioner is a habitual offender. Five cases under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (in short, “N.D.P.S. Act”) already stand registered against her. There were two cases under the said

Act registered against Kamaljit Singh, husband of the petitioner also. One case under Section 494/420 of the Indian Penal Code (in short, "I.P.C.") is stated to be registered against Rajbir Kaur daughter of the petitioner. List of cases with complete particulars has been filed alongwith the reply.

Heard the submissions made by Mr. Hardeep Singh, learned counsel representing the petitioner and Mr. Ashish Sanghi, learned Deputy Advocate General, representing the State of Punjab.

Learned Deputy Advocate General submitted that the instant petition has been filed on completely wrong facts and with the intention that the petitioner may not have to stop her business of drug trafficking.

As per the list filed, the particulars of the last case registered against the petitioner are First Information Report No.57 dated 17.04.2015 under Sections 15/18/21/22/61/85 N.D.P.S. Act. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that CRM-M-18897-2015 had been filed by the petitioner in which she has been allowed interim anticipatory bail because nothing had been recovered from her.

Anyhow, learned counsel for the petitioner could demonstrate nothing to support his contention that there was any threat perception to the life and liberty of the petitioner. The law was taking its own course as far as the cases registered against the petitioner are concerned. There being no ground for intervention, the instant petition is dismissed.

(SNEH PRASHAR)
JUDGE

July 09, 2015
jitender