

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

CRM No. M-5010 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 15.02.2017

Manju Devi

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Mohan Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for issuance of directions to the official respondents to take necessary steps to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner by voicing an apprehension that she faces a threat to the same at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 10.

Counsel contends that the private respondents are accused in FIR No.272 dated 13.06.2016, under Sections 148/149/323/452/506 IPC and Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act, registered at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh which has been got lodged at the instance of the present petitioner. It is further submitted that the police authorities are dragging their feet in the matter and are not proceeding against the private respondents herein. It is also the contention of the counsel that the private respondents have threatened the petitioner on a number of occasions and have even used derogatory remarks against the caste of the petitioner. Further contended that the petitioner was also physically assaulted on a number of occasions.

Having heard counsel for the petitioner at length, I am of the considered view that no directions as sought for can be passed in the instant petition.

The pleadings on record are completely vague. The threat perception voiced by the petitioner is not made out in the light of the averments. There is no specific incident/occurrence mentioned in the petition as regards the petitioner having been assaulted/threatened by anyone of the respondents.

No direction as prayed for, as such, can be issued in the light of such vague averments and pleadings on record.

Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

It is, however, observed that it would always be open for the petitioner to avail of any other alternate remedy that may be available to her in accordance with law.

15.02.2017

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | No |