

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

CRM-M-34946 of 2016.

Decided on:-03.10.2016.

Pawandeep Kaur and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

Present:- Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.

The petitioners have approached this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and further to investigate the matter. Prayer has also been made that the petitioners may be provided security to ensure that they are able to reside at their residence safely.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has referred to the order dated 18.6.2015 passed by this Court in ***CRM-M No.20163 of 2015*** titled as ***Pawandeep Kaur and another Versus State of Punjab and others***, whereby the petitioner No.1 Pawandeep Kaur along with her husband Amrik Singh had approached this Court to seek protection to their life and liberty as they had solemnized marriage against the wishes of respondents No.4 and 5 in that petition (father and brother of petitioner No.1).

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that after the

marriage, petitioner No.1 was harassed by her husband and in-laws. When she narrated the harassment to her family members, her husband Amrik Singh and his family members threatened the family members of petitioner No.1 that they would be killed in case they provide shelter to petitioner No.1. On 5.9.2016, when the petitioners were sitting in their own home, the accused, as referred in para No.6 of the present petition, inflicted injuries upon them. After the incident, the petitioners visited the Police Station, but the SHO concerned did not extend any protection to them.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has referred to the injuries caused to the petitioners and stated that when the medico-legal report (MLR) has been prepared by the doctor, it is incumbent upon the police to act on it and to provide security to the petitioners. It is standing procedure under the Code of Criminal Procedure to give protection to the complainant/injured, the moment when the MLR is received by the police.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

The record reveals that for the relief claimed in the present petition, the petitioners have not bothered even to approach the authorities concerned. The petitioners have straightway approached this Court without even making any prayer or representation to the police authorities for redressal of their grievances. Unless the petitioners point out their grievances to the concerned police authorities, the relief claimed in the present petition cannot be granted. The argument of learned counsel for the petitioners that the moment, when the MLR is prepared, it is incumbent upon the police to

provide protection to the injured, cannot be accepted.

The petitioners have approached this Court even without making any representation to the authorities. Therefore, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

October 03, 2016

Yag Dutt

**(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether Reportable: Yes / No