

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

**CRM-M No.14123 of 2017
Date of Decision:26.04.2017**

Amarjit Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

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

Present:Mr. I.S. Luthra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to respondents No.1 to 5 for protecting her life and personal liberty from being invaded at the hands of respondents No.6 to 9.

Petitioner filed a complaint before respondent No.3 on 15.12.2015 against the private respondents in respect of an occurrence which according to the petitioner was cognizable offence. When no action was taken, the petitioner ventured to file two representations before respondent No.2 on 13.10.2016 and 19.02.2017. Only a DDR No.19 was recorded, but no action was taken.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl, AG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3-State,

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to

pass, there is no necessity of calling upon reply.

This petition can be disposed of by directing respondent 2 to take notice of pending representations made by the petitioners. In case, the complaint of the petitioner discloses commission of some cognizable offence, then respondent No.3 can be directed to take action in accordance with law. If the complaint does not disclose any cognizable offence, then the petitioner can be informed as per parameters laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P.(2014) 2 SCC (1).**

26.04.2017
prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether Reasoned/Speaking

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No