

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr.No.113

CRWP No.5390 of 2021

Date of Decision: 28th June, 2021.

Meenakshi Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Others

...Respondents

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Gaurav Singla Advocate,
for the petitioner.

* * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has approached this Court with a prayer for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to protect her life and liberty as she apprehends threat to the same at the hands of respondent No.4 and she has averred that she was married to respondent No.4 but was being pressurized by him to bring more dowry and also being harassed for not being able to bear a child and therefore, she left her matrimonial home and is, presently, residing with her uncle. It has also been mentioned in this petition that a representation/application (Annexure P-1) has already been moved to respondent No.2 in this regard.

Ms. Samina Dhir, DAG, Punjab, has joined the

proceedings on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case in pursuance of the copies of this petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner restricts his prayer to the issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to take appropriate action on the said representation of the petitioner, i.e Annexure P-1.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

It is worthwhile to mention here that respondent No.4 is none other than the husband of the petitioner and as specifically mentioned in para No.7 of this petition, the petitioner herself left her matrimonial home.

However, keeping in view the intent of the fundamental right enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India which ensures the protection of life and liberty to the citizens and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter in hand, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur, is hereby directed to look into the said representation (Annexure P-1) and if it is found that the petitioner genuinely deserves any protection, then to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

It is further clarified that this order shall not be construed to be a shield to the petitioner against any proceedings already initiated or intended/contemplated to be initiated by the competent authority/person against her and permissible under any relevant

provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

28.06.2021.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether Reportable?	Yes/No