

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-40115 of 2015
Date of decision: 28.11.2015**

Rajinder Kaur

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment? Yes/No**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not? Yes/No**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No**

Present: Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed for issuance of direction to respondent No.2 to safeguard the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family members at the hands of respondents No.4 to 8, who are threatening the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier FIR was registered but subsequently, it was compromised and thereafter, again the petitioner was threatened. A written representation was also made to respondent No.2 on 18.05.2015, which is still pending. During pendency of the written representation, some persons in civil uniform came to the house of the petitioner just to put a pressure upon her to withdraw the complaint. It was the presumption of the petitioner that those persons might be the Police officials, who have been sent by the private respondents.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and

have also perused the representation as well as the averments made in this petition.

The compromise was effected between the parties with consent and it cannot be said at this stage that the petitioner was not ready for compromise. In the representation annexed as Annexure P-4 with the petition, nowhere it has been mentioned as to who went to the petitioner for giving threat. General allegations have been levelled and only the presumption is there that the persons have been sent by private respondents No.4 to 8. In case, any representation was made to the higher authorities, atleast description of those persons could have been mentioned therein but, nothing has been stated and as such, in such like circumstances, no direction can be issued.

Dismissed.

However, the petitioner is at liberty to move a fresh representation to respondent No.2 within a period of one week from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, any such representation is moved, respondent No.2 is directed to look into the representation, if filed and necessary action be taken in accordance with law.

28.11.2015
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE