

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

Crl. Misc. M-17825 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 22, 2018

Sharda Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Ms. Manjot Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mrs. Anju Arora, Addl. AG Punjab.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This is a petition that has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuing the appropriate and necessary direction to respondent No.1 to protect/safeguard the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family family, with a further direction to the respondents No.2 to 4 not to harass the petitioner and her family members, without registration of any case.

Notice of motion was issued in the matter.

In response to the notice, a status report has been filed by way of affidavit of Davinder Kumar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Circle Patran, in which it is stated that son of the petitioner is habitual of selling smack/intoxicant material etc. and there are about 11 cases registered against him. It is further stated that on 10.05.2017, as per the orders of

senior officers, a raid was conducted and at the time of raid, son of the petitioner was not found, however, his family members were present. In their presence, search of the house was conducted and Rs.2,01,600/- were found and taken into police possession through a search memo and were deposited in the malkhana, however, the petitioner could not give any reliable answer that from which source, the said money was earned by them. It is also mentioned that the allegations levelled by the petitioner are false.

Today, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-State, on instructions from ASI Harvinder Singh, submits that the petitioner and her family members were never harassed by the police and it was only in search of the son of the petitioner, who is habitual of selling and dealing with intoxicant, raids were conducted. It is stated that raids have already been conducted.

In view of the above, no further orders are called.

Disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous, leaving it open to the petitioner to approach again, in case, the need so arises.

February 22, 2018

vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No