

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh**

**Crl. Misc. No. M-19065 of 2017  
Date of Decision: 11.9.2018**

Santosh Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY**

Present: Mr. Sarabjit Singh Sidhu, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**ANITA CHAUDHRY, J**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner for direction to the official respondents to protect her life and liberty and for direction to the official respondents to register the FIR against the private respondent.

State had filed their affidavit on the last date of hearing.

I have heard both the sides.

The petitioner is working with Primary Health Centre. The allegation made by her was that the private respondent used to stalk, threaten and block her way when she was commuting for duty and had threatened to cause harm to her. The petitioner had pleaded that she had filed an application before CJM, Fazilka but no action was taken. The petitioner then gave details of the incident which occurred on 14.3.2017 and then on 28.4.2017 regarding which complaints Annexure P-3 and Annexure P-5, respectively were given. The petitioner had also disclosed that with

respect to Annexure P-3, a compromise was effected on 3.4.2017 (Annexure P-4).

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a widow with small children and harassment is continuing. He further submits that a complaint was filed on 14.3.2017 but a compromise was effected thereafter but the private respondent did not desist and was subjecting her to sexual harassment at workplace. It was urged that the private respondent was also working in the Health Centre and she had made a complaint to respondent No. 3 as well as to her superior namely the SMO of the Veterinary Hospital but no action had been taken.

State counsel states that the allegations are baseless and earlier she had moved an application in which a compromise was effected and the matter was settled and they have appended the statement made by her on 30.4.2017. She refers to Annexure R-1 and states that if any incident had occurred on 28.4.2017, she would not have made the statement in favour of the private respondent.

State had placed on record the status report and along with it is the statement given by the petitioner wherein she had made a categorical statement that she did not want the police to take any action on her application and that it may be filed. The statement was made on 30.4.2017.

In view of this, no directions are required to be given.

The petition is dismissed.

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**September 11, 2018**  
**Gurpreet**

**Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes**  
**Whether reportable : No**