

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

Sr.No.108

**CRM-M No.33137 of 2021
Date of Decision: 17.08.2021**

Shiba @ Aarti

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

After arguing for a while, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the instant petition while submitting that so far as the prayer of the petitioner qua the protection of her own as well as her husband's lives and liberty is concerned, she would be moving a fresh representation to respondent No.3 exclusively seeking the said relief therein and as regards the remaining relief as sought in the present petition, she would be availing the alternative efficacious remedy, as may be permissible to her under law, for this purpose. He further prays that the said respondent be directed to look into and take appropriate action on the fresh representation, as intended to be moved by the petitioner, within some specific time frame.

Mr. S.S. Pannu, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana,

.....

has joined the proceedings on behalf of all the respondents in this case, in pursuance of the copies of this petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance and he apprises the Court that during the inquiry as conducted by the concerned Deputy Superintendent of Police, the allegations levelled by the present petitioner against respondents No.4 to 10 have been found to be baseless and false. However, he has no objection to the above-said submission/prayer of learned counsel for the petitioner.

Resultantly, the petition in hand is hereby dismissed for having been withdrawn, with the observations that in case, the petitioner moves any fresh representation to respondent No.3-Superintendent of Police, Panipat, specifically restricting her prayer therein to the protection of her own and her husband's lives and liberty only, then the said respondent shall look into the same and if the petitioner and her husband would be found to be genuinely deserving the protection of their lives and liberty, then he would take appropriate action strictly in accordance with law, in the given set of facts and circumstances of the matter, preferably within a period of 10 days.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

17.08.2021
neetu

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>No</i>