

CRWP No. 6663 of 2021

Date of Decision: 05.08.2021

Manjeet Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sanjay Khan, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, DAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

On 19.07.2021, the following order had been recorded:-

*“Case heard via video conferencing.**By this petition, protection of the life and liberty of the petitioner is sought at the hands of respondent no. 4 (stated to be her father) and respondent no. 8 (her husband).**At the outset, learned counsel points out that on account of a typographical error, the petitioner has been shown to be the wife of Dharampal whereas she is actually the daughter of Dharampal and the wife of Happy Dhiman (respondent No. 8).**It is further submitted that upon respondent No. 8 ill-treating her, she had gone to her parents' house with them also having threatened her, and therefore she is now residing with a friend of hers at the address given in the memo of parties.**Notice of motion.**On the asking of the court, Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, learned DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3. Respondents no. 4 to 8 be served by normal process.*

Respondents no.4 to 7 be also served through the SHO of the police station concerned, i.e. respondent No. 3, and respondent No. 8 through the SHO of the police station at Rajpura in whose jurisdiction the address of respondent no. 8 would fall.

Adjourned to 5.8.2021.

In the meanwhile, since protection of life and liberty is a fundamental right of every citizen enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India, respondents No. 2 and 3 are directed to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioner are not put to any harm or threat at the hands of the aforesaid respondents or at their behest.

A gazetted officer is directed to file reply to the petition.”

Today, learned counsel for the petitioner (on instructions), submits (corroborated as per the instructions of learned State counsel also), that the petitioner is also not under any imminent threat from respondents no. 4 to 8 but, as and when she perceives any threat, she may be granted liberty to approach the official respondents to ensure her life and liberty is protected.

That being so, this petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

However, if any fresh threat is received or is perceived by the petitioner, she would obviously be at liberty to approach respondent no. 2, who would ensure that her life and liberty is duly protected as per law.

August 05, 2021
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No.