

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

217)

CRWP no.10150 of 2020
Date of Decision: 15.02.2021

Manu Rani and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Arun Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. S.S. Dinarpur, Advocate, for respondents 4 to 10.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

On 07.12.2020, the following order had been passed:

“All cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

By this petition, the petitioners seek for issuance of a writ in the nature of 'mandamus' directing respondents no. 2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty at the hands of respondents no. 4 to 10 and further, to not interfere in their personal life as the petitioners are residing in a live-in relationship.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners seek protection of their life and liberty, they being in such live in relationship, with petitioner no. 1 stated to be married to respondent no. 10 but with her having left her matrimonial home.

Notice of motion be issued to the respondents, returnable on 12.01.2021.

In the meanwhile, the life of the petitiones would be protected by respondents no. 2 and 3, with their liberty also duly protected, as per law,

unless any cognizable offence is made out in respect of which a complaint has been registered.

A gazetted officer is directed to file a reply to the petition by the next date of hearing.”

Pursuant thereto, a short reply by way of an affidavit of the DSP, Shahbad, Kurukshetra, has been filed.

As per the reply filed by the DSP, it has been stated that the petitioners were in fact offered to be sent to protection home at Kurukshetra as they apprehended some danger at the hands of respondents no.4 to 10 (though initially they stated that they did not have any apprehension). However, they are stated to have refused to go to the protection home, with the DSP stating that therefore if they at any time they apprehended danger to their lives, naturally the police would take action accordingly on such complaint received.

Mr. Dinarpur, learned counsel for respondents no.4 to 10, submits that it is petitioner no.2 who is threatening the said respondents with the said petitioner also having criminal antecedents, he having been convicted for the commission of an offence punishable under Section 326 of the IPC.

He reiterates what has been submitted by the said respondents before the police (even as per the affidavit of the DSP), that the said respondents are not threatening the petitioners and would not threaten them in any manner.

Learned counsel for the petitioners denies the petitioners having

ever threatened respondents no.4 to 10, and undertakes that the petitioners would not threaten them.

That being so, this petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous, but with obviously liberty available to either party, that in case they receive any threat from the other, they would approach the concerned police authority for taking action as per law.

15.02.2021
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No