

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-1886-2021

Date of decision: 08.02.2021

Talwinder Kaur

.....Petitioner.

vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

**CORAM: - HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR
HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI**

Present: - Mr. Lajwant Singh Virk, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Suveer Sheokhand, Additional Advocate General,
Punjab.

.....

Sanjay Kumar, J. (ORAL)

The prayer of the petitioner in this case is two fold. Firstly, she assailed the shifting/transfer of the polling stations for Ward Number 10 to a place falling in Ward Number 33. Her second prayer is to direct the Senior Superintendent of Police, Khanna, to protect her life and liberty and also the lives and liberty of her family members. This prayer is based on the apprehension of a threat from the sixth respondent, a private party, who is stated to be an influential leader of the ruling party.

Insofar as the first prayer is concerned, Mr. Suveer Sheokhand, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, had informed this Court on 28.01.2021, upon instructions from Harbans Singh, SDM, Khanna, that the decision with regard to the shifting of polling stations from Ward Number 10 to Ward Number 33 has been reviewed and would not be acted upon. He sought an adjournment to produce a written assurance to that effect.

Today, Mr. Suveer Sheokhand, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, produced Memo dated 27.01.2021 addressed by the State Election Commission, Punjab, to the Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Electoral Officer, Ludhiana, furnishing the revised list of polling stations. The learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, would state that the list evidences that the polling stations have not been shifted from Ward Number 10 to Ward Number 33.

Mr. Lajwant Singh Virk, learned counsel for the petitioner, would however state that the second prayer of the petitioner still remains unaddressed. He would assert that after filing of the writ petition, certain incidents came to pass which support the contention of the petitioner that she and her family members are under threat. However, the learned counsel fairly concedes that no affidavit was filed bringing the said facts on record in the present petition.

This being the situation, it would be appropriate that the petitioner makes a representation to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Khanna, setting out the details of the events that allegedly took place after filing of this writ petition and seek appropriate intervention on the strength thereof, if justified.

In the event such a representation is made, this Court is certain that the Senior Superintendent of Police, Khanna, would look into the same and take necessary measures, as warranted.

With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

No order as to costs.

(SANJAY KUMAR)
JUDGE

(ARCHANA PURI)
JUDGE

08.02.2021

preeti

whether speaking/non speaking

yes/no

whether reportable/non reportable

yes/no