

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(207)

CRWP-5032-2020

Date of Decision : 28.09.2020

REKHA RANI

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

(through video conferencing)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Kulbhushan Raheja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

Reply has been filed by learned State counsel in Court today.

The same is taken on record.

Present petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging harassment to her and her family at the hands of respondents and is also seeking protection to their life and liberty.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner and her husband are being harassed and are being called by the respondents to the police station time and again without any justification. Learned counsel for the petitioner further states that the petitioner and her husband have apprehension that they will be implicated in some false case.

Upon notice of motion, the respondents have filed the reply and

in the reply, following averments have been made :-

“3. That it is worthwhile to mention here that Sandeep Kumar, husband of petitioner is not required by the police of P.S. City, Kotkapura nor any raid has been conducted as alleged. In fact, the present petition has been filed in anticipation as the case FIR No. 63 dated 02.06.2015, under Sections 380, 295-A, 414, 451, 120-B IPC of P.S. Bajakhana the investigation is being carried out by Special Investigation Team headed by respondent No. 2 and some of the culprits apprehended by SIT on 04.07.2020 who are already involved in the case FIR No. 33(supra). Even though the husband of petitioner namely Sandeep Kumar is not required for investigation in case FIR No. 63 (supra) for the time being but the petitioner apprehends the arrest of her husband and, therefore, the present petition has been filed with ulterior and oblique motive to circumvent the investigation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the said reply, it may be directed that in case the petitioner or her husband are required for any enquiry, advance 7 days notice be given to them.

Learned counsel for the respondents states that in case either the petitioner or husband are required for any enquiry/investigation, 7 days notice will be given to the petitioner or her husband at the address mentioned in this petition.

That being so, no grievance of the petitioner survives any further and no order is required to be passed by this Court in the present petition.

Present petition is disposed of accordingly.

September 28, 2020
kanchan/naresh.k

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No