

109

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

CRM-M-20877-2022

Date of decision : 16.05.2022

Darshna

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to comply with the provisions of Section 160 of Cr.P.C. while calling the petitioner with respect to complaint given by respondent No.4 (daughter-in-law of the petitioner).

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that till date, there is no FIR registered against the petitioner and the petitioner is being repeatedly called at the Police Station without serving any written notice under Section 160 of Cr.P.C.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further stated that the petitioner would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the present petition is

disposed of with directions to the official respondents to issue written notice under Section 160 of Cr.P.C. prior to calling her to the Police Station with respect to enquiry in the complaint given by respondent No.4.

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 3 only.

On advance notice, Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and has submitted that in case, no FIR has been registered against the petitioner, then, notice, in accordance with law, would be issued to the petitioner.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is disposed of with directions to the official respondents to issue three days prior written notice under Section 160 of Cr.P.C. to the petitioner, in case, she is required to be called for enquiry in the complaint moved by respondent No.4.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

It is made clear that in case, there is FIR registered against the petitioner, then the present order would not ensue any benefit to the petitioner.

16.05.2022

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No