

119

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

CRWP-7120-2021

Date of Decision: 30.07.2021

Avjot Kaur

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Varinder Basa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has filed this petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect her life, liberty and property and further to restrain private respondent Nos.4 to 10 from harassing her or interfering in her peaceful life. Further prayer has been made for issuance of directions to the official respondents to conduct fair and proper investigation in case FIR No.86 dated 06.08.2020, registered under Sections 323, 325, 506 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has invited the attention of the Court to the photographs of the petitioner (Annexure P-3) and contended that the private respondents had given beatings to the petitioner, and on her complaint, a case FIR No.86 dated 06.08.2020, under Sections 323, 325, 506 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian was registered against respondents No.5, 6, 8 and 10. He submits that the private respondents are close relatives of the petitioner, who are denying her

share in the ancestral property and further they all are extending threats to the petitioner. He submits that in this regard, a representation dated 29.07.2020 (Annexure P-4) has already been given, but till date, no protection has been provided.

At this stage, learned State counsel has pointed out that in the above mentioned FIR, the investigation has been completed and the final report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C. stands filed before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

This fact is not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the alleged occurrence took place more than a year back and thereafter, no untoward incident has taken place. He has fairly stated that the petitioner has already filed a suit for possession against the private respondents in respect of her ancestral property and the same is pending adjudication.

After hearing the learned counsel and considering the above background, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

30.07.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes No
Yes No