

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3676 of 2020

Date of Decision: 13.08.2020

Sunita Verma and another

... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. APS Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rahul, Advocate,
for respondents no.4 to 8.

Mr. Manish Bansal, D.A.G., Haryana.

Amol Rattan Singh, J.(Oral)

On 12.06.2020, the following order had been passed:-

“All the cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

By way of this petition, the petitioners are seeking protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of respondents No.4 to 8, of whom respondent no.6 is their daughter-in-law, respondents no.4 and 5 being her parents and respondents no.7 and 8 being her brothers.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the dispute between the petitioners and their daughter-in-law and family members has been ongoing for some time, with a complaint

earlier also filed with the police as has been done now, but no action has been taken.

He further submits that respondent no.6 wishes to reside with her husband, i.e. the son of the petitioners, separate from the petitioners, which was earlier not being agreed to, but the petitioners having reconciled to that fact, they now are willing to live separate from their son.

Upon as to why any protection of lives and liberty is required, he points to paragraph 4 of the petition, to submit that even now the private respondents are threatening the petitioners on telephone and are hurling filthy abuses on them which were recorded by the petitioners but with the recording not having been annexed along with the petition due to the language used, by the said respondents.

He next submits that in fact the respondents are put to notice, the matter can be resolved amicably.

On further query as to whether any complaint has been filed by the respondents till the filing of the petition against the petitioners, he replies in the negative.

Without making any comment at this stage on the contention raised, let notice of motion be issued to the respondents, with Mr. Pradeep Prakash Chahar, learned DAG, Haryana, accepting notice on behalf of respondents no.1 to 3 at the asking of the court, with him already having received an advanced copy of the petition.

Adjourned to 20.07.2020.

The Superintendent of Police, Panchkula, is directed to have the matter enquired into and get an affidavit of a gazetted officer filed with regard to the dispute and as to whether it has been or can be resolved, by the next date of hearing.

In the meanwhile, the lives and liberty of the petitioners would be duly protected at the hands of respondents no.4 to 8 or any other persons, within the parameters of law.”

A reply to the petition has been filed by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Kalka, Panchkula, in which it is eventually stated that it being a family dispute, no protection is needed by the petitioners, with learned counsel for the petitioners, as also for respondents no.4 to 8, also submitting that the matter can be resolved amicably.

That being so, with learned counsel for the respondents no.4 to 8 also having given an undertaking that the petitioners would not be threatened by the said respondents or at their behest, this petition is disposed of, with it however directed that the petitioners as also petitioner no.2 and his son, as also respondents no.4 and 5 would appear before the learned Mediator in the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this court on 14.09.2020, to try and sit together and resolve the differences.

It is made clear that during the mediation proceedings proper distancing will be maintained qua each person by wearing masks; and all, including the learned Mediator, to maintain distancing.

August 13, 2020
dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

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