

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

**CRWP No.761 of 2020
Date of Decision: 23.01.2020**

Kuldip Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Abhijeet P, S. Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has preferred this petition for issuance of appropriate direction to respondent No.2 to safeguard/protect her life and personal liberty from being invaded by respondent No.5.

Petitioner has alleged that she was married with one Jodh Singh in the year 2009. Two children took birth from this wedlock. Jodh Singh had left her company and went to abroad. Respondent No.5 is distant relative of her husband and he came into company with the petitioner and developed some illicit

relations. Respondent No.5 has recorded some objectionable postures by way of indecent videography and now he has started blackmailing the petitioner with a threat to upload indecent video on social media. Petitioner wants to get rid of respondent No.5.

Precisely for that reason and to avoid unbearable sexual atrocities, she has approached respondent No.3 for taking appropriate action, but respondent No.3 has not responded to the request of the petitioner. Ultimately, petitioner filed representation before respondent No.2 on 06.12.2019. The said representation is also pending before respondent No.2 without any further action.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Ghumman, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4/State. Four copies of the petition have been supplied to him during course of the day.

In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity for calling upon any response from the official respondents.

This petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the allegations of the petitioner and if the same are found to be established, then take corrective

measures in accordance with law. Respondent No.2 would also be at liberty to devise his own mechanism to ascertain the truth behind allegations of the petitioner without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded hereinabove. He would be at liberty to devise his own ways and means to evaluate the innocence of the petitioner in accordance with law.

23.01.2020

Prince

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Whether reasoned/speaking
Whether reportable**

**Yes/No
Yes/No**