

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

**CRM-M No.14282 of 2017
Date of decision: 26.04.2017**

Mamta Sharma

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL

Present: Mr. Jaideep Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

REKHA MITTAL J.

By invoking Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short 'Cr.P.C.') the petitioner prays for issuance of directions to respondents No.1 to 4 to register criminal case under Sections 354-A, 354-B, 354-D, 452, 323, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC') and 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 against respondents No.6 and 7 as they have outraged modesty of daughter of the petitioner with a further direction for investigation by a senior police officer in an impartial and time bound manner.

I have perused the averments raised in the petition, various annexures appended thereto and heard counsel for the petitioner but am of the opinion that no intervention in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is warranted.

Prima facie, it appears that there is some dispute between the petitioner and respondents No.6 and 7 with regard to running of a tea stall by the petitioner and a canteen by respondents No.6 and 7 in a

company namely P & R situated at village Behrampur Zimidara, Tehsil and District Rupnagar. The petitioner has also placed on record a compromise deed (Annexure P3). On a query raised by the Court, counsel for the petitioner would inform that the said compromise pertains to vacation of a house by respondents No.6 and 7 belonging to her brother and the respondents in pursuance of the compromise have already vacated the house, the date next to recording of the compromise dated 18.04.2017. However, counsel has submitted that though the compromise bears the signatures of the petitioner but she was forced to sign the same and has nothing to do with the house of her brother when otherwise, she does not have cordial relations with her brother. There is not even a whisper in the petition that the petitioner does not have cordial relations with her brother or the house to which the reference has been made in the compromise belongs to her brother. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of but without prejudice to rights of the petitioner to take recourse to appropriate alternate remedy, in accordance with law.

Nothing stated hereinbefore shall be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the controversy and the observations would be confined to disposal of the present petition.

26.04.2017
yakub

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No