

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-21213-2015

Date of decision: 03.07.2015

Nancy Sondhi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. NAGRATH

PRESENT: Mr. GS Jagpal, Advocate for the petitioner.

R.P. NAGRATH, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of a direction to respondent No. 2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondents No. 3 and 4.

Earlier similar petition bearing CRM-M-1671-2015 was filed by the petitioner which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 13.03.2015 (Annexure P-1) and the order reads thus:-

“Learned counsel for respondents no. 4 to 11 submits that respondents no. 4, 7 and 8 are present in person.

Learned State counsel has filed the reply/affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Tarn Taran, which is taken on record. It is submitted that the matter stood compromised. It is also submitted that as per reply the petitioner does not want to go to her parents.

Learned counsel for respondents no. 4 to 11 on instructions states that the respondents undertake not to interfere in the life and liberty of the petitioners.

In view of the above, no further indulgence of this Court is required and the instant petition is disposed of as such.

Needless to say that the private respondents shall remain bound by the undertaking made on behalf of them in the Court, which shall form part of this order.”

Once this Court had disposed of the matter by accepting the undertaking of private respondents in CRM-M-1671-2015 and also reply filed by the State, I am of the considered view that again indulgence of this Court is not required.

The petitioner has not filed any fresh representation to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran.

In view of the above, the instant petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to file a comprehensive representation before respondent No. 2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran though it is submitted by learned petitioner's counsel that the same was made but was not accepted by the office of respondent No. 2. Liberty is also granted to the petitioner to pursue the same apart from other appropriate remedy.

July 03, 2015
rishu

(R.P. NAGRATH)
JUDGE