

106

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

CRWP No. 3403 of 2020
Date of Decision: 04.06.2020

Raj Rani Gupta

-Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Naveen Siwach, Advocate, for
Mr. T.P.S. Bhatti, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

Petitioner has preferred this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of necessary directions to the official respondents to protect life and personal liberty of the petitioner from being invaded at the hands of respondent No.4, who is none else, but real younger son of the petitioner.

The dispute appears to be on account of a family feud.

Precisely for the reasons mentioned in the petition, petitioner has already approached respondent No.3 by way of a complaint regarding physical and mental harassment meted out to the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Luvinder Sofar, A.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

This petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.3 to visualize the situation arising out of the allegations made in the complaint and act in accordance with law.

If some cognizable offence is found to have been committed, respondent No.3 shall act as per law. If no cognizable offence is found to have been committed, the complainant would be intimated as per the law laid down in **Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

June 04, 2020

Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes/No