

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

**CRWP No. 8017 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.10.2020.**

Soni

..... Petitioner.

Versus

UT of Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Judgepreet Singh Warring, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhra Dalal Anand, APP, UT Chandigarh
for respondents No. 1 to 3.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking a direction to the official respondents to protect her life and liberty, as it is alleged that respondents No. 4 and 5 are harassing the petitioner.

It is stated in the petition that petitioner was married to respondent No. 4 in the year 2001 and out of the marriage three children were born. It is stated that respondent No. 4 has been harassing the petitioner and she has taken shelter with a person, namely, Sunil son of Kalu, and at present she is residing with him.

Learned State counsel had informed the Coordinate Bench of this Court on 06.10.2020 that although the petitioner has stated that she is residing with one Sunil son of Kalu at the address which is mentioned in the representation, but on inquiry it was found that neither the petitioner nor

Sunil son of Kalu is residing at the given address at least for the last two years. The statement of the owner of the house had also been recorded to this effect. Learned counsel for the petitioner had sought an adjournment to seek instructions with regard to the factum of the petitioner residing with Sunil at the given address.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to explain as to why the petitioner had given the aforementioned address even though she and Sunil have not been residing at that place at least for the last two years. Even otherwise, the averments in the petition that the petitioner is being harassed by respondents No. 4 and 5 are unsubstantiated. No instance has been mentioned as to how respondents No. 4 and 5 have harassed the petitioner. The petitioner is the wife of respondent No. 4 and she has left the company of her husband and the children. Therefore, I do not find any merit in this petition at this stage.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed at this stage.

Pending application, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

12.10.2020
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No