

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

CRM-M No.464 of 2017

Date of Decision: January 13, 2017

Kuldeep Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to respondents No.1 to 3 for providing adequate security to the petitioner in terms of her life and liberty.

The petitioner alleged that Punjab Wakf Board was the owner of the property, the petitioner along with her husband and father-in-law are in possession of the same. The husband of the petitioner had gone abroad. Petitioner along with her children and father-in-law are residing in the property in question.

Petitioner applied for lease from the Wakf Board and

also paid lease amount for the period from 01.12.2012 to 31.10.2013 and became lessee to the Wakf property.

Petitioner further alleged that respondents No.4 to 13 are totally stranger to the property and under the garb of some mechanism, they have started claiming title on the property. Initially, the petitioner filed a suit for injunction against her father-in-law in which he had given a statement that he would not dispossess the petitioner from the property in question. Thereafter, respondents No.4 to 13 started interfering in the property. Petitioner also filed a suit for permanent injunction against them which was decreed by the trial Court on 02.05.2014. Respondents No.4 to 13 remained unsuccessful in appeal before the lower Appellate Court which was dismissed on 12.08.2015. Earlier CRM-M No.16367 of 2014 filed by daughter of the petitioner was ordered to be disposed of by the High Court vide order dated 12.08.2014.

Precisely for the grievance in question, petitioner has filed representations dated 02.07.2014 and 10.03.2015 before respondent No.2.

At this stage, without expressing anything on the merits of the case, this petition can be disposed of by obligating respondent No.2 to have a fair look on the cause of the petitioner and decide her representations in accordance with law.

Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to associate the petitioner and any other person while deciding the representations in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

January 13, 2017

Jyoti Y.

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No