

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

107

**CRWP No.9687 of 2020
Date of Decision:24.11.2020**

SONIA BAGHEL AND ANR

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....Respondents

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

Present: Ms.Jasneet Mehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

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

Petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to the official respondents i.e. respondents No. 1 to 3 for protection of their lives and liberties from being invaded by respondent No.4.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has alleged that the petitioners are sister-in-law (nanad) and brother-in-law of respondent No.4. Respondent No.4 along with her children is residing in the same house. Petitioner No.1, her deceased brother Jagdeep (husband of respondent No.4) and sister Kiran Baghel succeeded the property of Suraj Pal through his wife Santosh. Suraj Pal had executed a Will in favour of Santosh

and thereafter, Santosh divided her property in three equal parts in favour of all her three children, namely, Sonia Baghel, Kiran Baghel and Jagdeep Baghel (deceased). Jagdeep had committed suicide on 11.8.2020. Respondent No.4 has already rented out the share of her husband in favour of Sachdeva Electrical and now the same is still continuing. Respondent No.4 is living at the first floor since the time of commission of suicide by her husband. DDR was got registered in the police station. There was no suspicion at that time in respect of any incriminating allegation, causing abetment for the suicide by Jagdeep. 'No objection' was taken under the proceedings under Section 174 Cr.P.C. Recently, petitioner No.1 came across some call recordings to know that there was a serious matrimonial conflict between respondent No.4 and her husband Jagdeep and due to which Jagdeep took ultimate step of ending his life. On being confronted, respondent No.4 became annoyed and she started threatening the petitioners and other family members that in case the entire family property is not transferred in her name, she will commit suicide and will implicate the entire family in serious cases.

Owing to such a threat at the instance of respondent No.4, petitioner No.1 has already moved a representation before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala- respondent

No.2 on 18.10.2020 (Annexure P-1), which is still pending before the said authority.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl.A.G.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.2 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 24 , 2020

anita

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No