

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

115

**CRWP No.9654 of 2020
Date of Decision:23.11.2020**

GURDAS SACHDEVA AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr.Krishan Sehajpal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

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

Petitioners, who are senior citizens, and have preferred this petition for issuance of directions to the official respondents i.e. respondents No.2 to 5 for protection of their lives and liberties from being invaded by respondent Nos. 6 to 8.

Petitioners have five daughters and one son i.e. Respondent No.6. Respondent No.7 is wife of respondent No.6 and respondent No.8 is brother-in-law of respondent No.6. A shoes shop was opened by petitioner No.1 in the year 1974 in a rented premises. Petitioners have solemnized marriages of their five daughters and provided higher studies to them. They have

already performed their duties towards their children regarding studies and marriages. Daughters were married about 15 years ago and son (respondent No.6) was married about 7 years ago. Respondent No.6 could not get job and the petitioners kept on helping him and providing him all the basic amenities including expenses towards children. Respondent No.7 was earlier married to some other person and her second marriage was performed with respondent No.6. Respondents No.6 and 7 never cooperated with the petitioners and used to harass them. For the last two years, respondents No.6 and 7 are pressurizing the petitioners to transfer the shop in their names, but the petitioners did not agree. Now the petitioners feel reasonable apprehension from private respondents as they have given threats to the petitioners.

For the grievance in question, petitioners have already approached the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala- respondent No.3 by way of representation dated 05.10.2020 (Annexure P-2) (wrongly typed as 15.12.2020 in para No.9 of the petition), but no action has been taken on the same so far.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. R.S.Thind, DAG, Punjab

accepts notice on behalf of the State.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of calling upon any response from the respondents as no order prejudicial to interest of any party is being passed.

In view of above, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, this petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.3 to have a fair look on the representation filed by the petitioners and decide the same in accordance with law without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded herein above. It would be appreciated if the representation filed by the petitioners is decided within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

November 23, 2020

anita

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No