

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

**231**

**CRWP-6374-2021**

**Decided on : 28.09.2021**

Asghar

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondents

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

**(Through Video Conferencing)**

**PRESENT:** Mr. Azad Khan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Nafeesh Ahmed, Advocate  
for respondents No. 4 to 10.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

The present Criminal Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to provide adequate protection to the petitioner as well as restraining respondents No. 4 to 10 from harassing the petitioner and registering FIR against them.

The case of the petitioner is that the respondent No. 4-Sahina who was married to the petitioner, has committed certain acts, on account of which, there is apprehension to his life and liberty.

Reply by way of affidavit on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 has been filed in the Court today, which is taken on record.

Learned State counsel has referred to the said reply and has also referred to the statement of respondent No. 4-Sahina and also of other

respondents (Annexure R-1 to R-7). In the statement of said Sahina, it has been submitted that she did not have any conversation with the petitioner and has never even threatened him. It is further stated in the said statement that the parents of respondent No. 4-Sahina had solemnized her marriage with Mubarik (respondent No. 9) and thus, there is no question of giving threat to the petitioner nor has she given any threat to snatch the children from him. Similarly, other private respondents have also stated in their statements that neither have they ever threatened the petitioner nor there was any occasion for them to threaten the petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing for respondents No. 4 to 10 has reiterated the fact that they have never threatened the petitioner and there was no occasion for them to threaten the petitioner.

From the aforesaid facts, it appears that the present petition has been filed only on account of the fact that he possibly would have been unhappy with his wife for having left him and that there is no threat to the life of the petitioner from the private respondents No. 4 to 10, thus, the present petition is dismissed.

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

**28.09.2021**

*Mehak*

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No