

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

CRWP-765-2022

Date of decision-28.02.2022

Khushpreet Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Sahil Pwar, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

The petitioner has filed this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr.P.C for issuance of directions to the official respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect her life and liberty from the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 11.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that respondent No.4 is step father of the petitioner, who harassed her on many occasions by doing objectionable acts and when petitioner narrated this to her mother, she threatened her to not to disclose this to anybody. He submits that on 23.01.2020, petitioner left her house and is now residing with her relative-Harinder Singh. He has further argued that the private respondents threatened the petitioner and Harinder Singh of dire consequences, therefore, a representation dated 24.01.2022 (Annexure P-1) has already been given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Malerkotla, however, no action has been

taken upon the same. He prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the victim was not physically violated by her step father, i.e. respondent No.4 and he fairly states that in the representation, there is no such accusation except attributing certain objectionable act to respondent No.4.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court finds that the prayer is directed against the parents of minor girl, and the status of Harinder Singh as her guardian is not worth acceptance. It needs to be noticed here that averment in the petition regarding beatings of petitioner are not supported by any convincing material, much less any complaint to the police.

Apart from it, the allegations made in the representation dated 24.01.2022 (Annexure P-1) also lack material particulars, as it does not at all reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioner.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

28.02.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No