

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

**CRM-M No. 10912 of 2017
Date of Decision: 30.03.2017**

Rajwinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner alleges incriminating instances against her own son, i.e. respondent No. 5. Husband of the petitioner died on 13.03.2013 and thereafter, the attitude of respondent No. 5 became bad to worse. He intends to grab the property by illegal means, even though, the petitioner has already disinherited him from her estate.

Petitioner seeks protection of her life and personal liberty from being invaded by respondent No. 5.

Precisely, for the grievance in question, a representation dated 04.03.2017 has already been moved to respondent No. 2.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. P.S. Ghuman, Additional A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4.

At this stage, in view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of filing any reply to the petition as no order prejudicial to interest of any of the party is being passed.

This petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 to look into the grievance of the petitioner in context of her representation dated 04.03.2017. If some cognizable offence is found to have been committed, then respondent No. 4 can be asked to act in accordance with law. If no substance is found in the allegations of the petitioner, then the petitioner can be informed in view of parameters as laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

March 30, 2017
Apurva

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No