

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

216

**CRWP-867-2020**

**Decided on : 04.10.2021**

Sapna

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

**(Through Video Conferencing)**

**PRESENT:** Mr. Rishav Jain, Advocate and  
Mr. Kanish Jindal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)**

The present Criminal Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner.

On 28.01.2020, a Coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

*“The petitioner has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner from danger at the hands of respondents No.4 to 5 and not to interfere in the peaceful life of the petitioner.*

*Notice of motion.*

*On the asking of the Court, Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, AAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. Three copies of the paper book have been supplied to learned*

*State Counsel, who seeks time to complete his instructions.*

*Adjourned to 16.03.2020.*

*Notice to respondents No.4 and 5 be issued for that date on filing of process fee by the petitioner and notice be also given dasti, if so desired.*

*In the meanwhile, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Palwal is directed to look into the grievances of the petitioner as set out in the petition and also expressed in the representation dated 22.01.2020 (Annexure P-3) and take appropriate action for protection of life and liberty of the petitioner as may be warranted by the circumstances.*

*Registry is directed to send a copy of this order along with copy of the petition and above-said representation to respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, Palwal for requisite compliance.”*

Learned State counsel has pointed out that in the present case, the reply has been filed and even the statement of the petitioner has been recorded and the affidavit of the petitioner has already been taken on record which is annexed as Annexure R-1 alongwith the said reply.

A perusal of the said affidavit would show that the petitioner has stated that she does not have any apprehension of danger from either her family or from Anil's Family and that she does not want to take any action on her petition nor does she require protection.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the said reply and affidavit, the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

Keeping in view the above said facts and the statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is

disposed of, having been rendered infructuous.

However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to move a fresh representation before respondent No. 2- Senior Superintendent of Police in case of any apprehension in future and in case, such a representation is moved then, respondent No. 2 is directed to look into the matter and take appropriate action, in accordance with law.

**(VIKAS BAHL)**  
**JUDGE**

**04.10.2021**  
*Mehak*

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