

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

**CRWP No. 2657 of 2021
Date of Decision: 17.03.2021**

Sunita Vasudev and another

Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Deepak Verma, Advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Bhavna Gupta, DAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The matter is taken up for hearing through video conference due to COVID-19 situation.

This is a petition for seeking directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and not to harass them at the behest of private respondent No. 6.

The facts in brief are that the petitioners filed two civil suits for permanent injunction and for declaration. The declaration sought was with regard to disconnection of the electric connection. Respondent No. 6 also filed a suit for permanent injunction. In the suit filed by respondent No.6, status quo order was passed on 20.4.2019. On 5.11.2020, an application was moved by respondent No. 6 to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur stating that on the basis of fake documents, the petitioners want to grab his property. On 17.11.2020, a statement was made by respondent No. 6 through his attorney before the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Garhshankar that there is no threat from the defendants (petitioner in this petition) and he wants to withdraw the civil suit. The suit was dismissed as withdrawn on 12.12.2020.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that inspite of the statement made in the civil suit and withdrawal thereof, the police is still proceeding with the application given by respondent No. 6 on 5.11.2020. He further submits that similar complaints were made earlier in which respondent No. 6 failed. The grievance is that the petitioners have moved an application on 5.3.2021 but the same is not being dealt with.

From the perusal of the pleadings and the documents placed on record, it is not forth coming that after 12.12.2020 any proceedings have been initiated by the police on the application made by respondent No. 6 on 5.11.2020.

There is a long drawn litigation between the petitioners and respondent No. 6. From a cursory look on the application moved by the petitioners, it is evident that apart from the bald statement being made that the complaint made by respondent No. 6 is frivolous and the petitioners are being harassed to vacate the property, there are no specific allegations or even *prima facie* material to substantiate it.

There is nothing on the record to show that the petitioners were ever called to the police station in relation to the complaint made by respondent No. 6 or even any reply or response was filed by the petitioners. In such circumstances, no interference is called for in the writ jurisdiction.

The petition is dismissed.

However, the petitioners shall be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law for redressal of any surviving grievance.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

17th March, 2021
mk

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes
2. Whether reportable	:	No