

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

CRWP-1255-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.08.2021

Manju Bala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. D.S. Gandhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, DAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

CRM-W-911-2021

Application is allowed as prayed for. The FIR as well as other documents are taken on record.

Main case:

Prayer in the present petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family members at the hands of the official respondents against whom she has already filed a criminal complaint under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and her family members are suffering at the hands of the official respondents

against whom FIR No. 62 dated 27.01.2019, under Sections 166, 166A, 167, 217 and 218 IPC, stands registered at Police Station Thanesar City, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in case, the State undertakes to provide security to the petitioner and her family members as and when required, he would not press the present petition.

At this, learned State counsel submits that vide affidavit dated 06.01.2020, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, has already submitted that the petitioner is habitual in filing such type of petitions.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is the bounden duty of the Police to protect the life and liberty of every citizen, including the petitioner.

Learned State counsel submits that as undertaken in the aforesaid affidavit by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, the police is always ready to protect the life and liberty of every citizen, and would also be ready to provide such protection to the petitioner, if and when required.

In view of the above, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not want to press the present petition.

Dismissed as not pressed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

10.08.2021

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No