

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

CRWP No.2909 of 2022
Date of Decision:31.03.2022

Sushma Rani and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Arun Chander Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

Fearing for life and liberty at the hands of the private respondents, the petitioner, invoking the fundamental right of life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, has come up before this Court seeking protection through the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would be confining his prayer to the protection to the petitioners in the present petition reserving his right to file a separate petition for habeas corpus for protection to husband of petitioner No. 1.
3. Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order that this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondents nor the issuance of notices to the private respondents is required
4. If the allegations of apprehension of threat to life turn out to be true, it might lead to an irreversible loss. Thus, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it shall be appropriate that the concerned Superintendent of Police, SHO, or any officer to whom such powers have been delegated or have been authorized in this regard, provide appropriate protection to the petitioner for one week from today. However, if the petitioner no longer requires the protection, then at their request, it may be discontinued even before the expiry of one week. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities or upon the oral or written request of the petitioner.
5. This protection is subject to the stringent condition that from the time such protection is given, the petitioner shall not go outside the boundaries of the place of residence, except for medical necessities, to buy household necessities, and forbereavements in the families of the close relatives or close friends. This restriction saves the petitioner from apprehended risk and ensures that the protection is not flaunted.
6. It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits and that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation

CRWP No.2909 of 2022

of the petitioner is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for the petitioner to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

7. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order, and any Advocate for the Petitioner and State can download this order and other relevant particulars from the official web page of this court and attest it to be a true copy. The concerned officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for immediate use.*

Petition is allowed only for protection with life and liberty to the petitioners as mentioned above. Petitioner No. 1 would be at liberty to file a habeas corpus for protection of her husband, if need arises. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

31.03.2022
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.