

226 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43540-2021
Date of Decision : 24.11.2021

Nirmala Devi ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

(Through Video Conferencing)

ANOOP CHITKARA, J (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as far as threat perception to the petitioner is concerned, she had last contacted him way back on 28.10.2021 and after that she did not contact him till today.

Reply by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar has been filed by the State, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel submits that although the parties has criminal antecedents and the possibility of threat perception is likely to be there given the criminal antecedents of both the parties. However, learned State counsel has argued that protection cannot be granted such like people who has criminal antecedents because it would further aggravate the law and order in the society.

Be that as it may, in case the petitioner had any threat perception then she would have certainly contacted her counsel. In fact, her silence for such a long period itself indicates that there is no threat perception. Consequently, the present petition is **dismissed**.

The interim protection order dated 14.10.2021 is hereby recalled. However, it shall be open for the petitioner to file fresh petition in case any threat perception arises.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

November 24, 2021
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No