

**273 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRWP-5871-2022
Date of Decision: 12th July, 2022**

Sanjay Kumar and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of U.T, Chandigarh and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Ms. R.K. Grewal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, APP, U.T., Chandigarh.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

1. This petition was filed seeking directions to the official respondent to protect life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of private respondents (arrayed in the petition).

2. The grievance raised is that the representation dated 2nd June, 2022 given by the petitioner No.1 was not decided.

3. From the pleadings it is forthcoming that there is matrimonial dispute between petitioner No.1 and respondent No.6.

4. From the perusal of the representation, it is forthcoming that the dispute between the husband and wife due to temperamental differences have been made basis for seeking police protection. There is an allegation that on 23rd April, 2022, the wife tried to strangle the petitioner and there were nail marks on his neck. The other allegation is that on 29th May, 2022, the request of the petitioner to his wife to iron his clothes was refused and she gave a leg blow to the petitioner, resultantly, his head hit the almirah. Suffice to say that no medical evidence is attached either the representation or this petition, to substantiate the allegation.

5. On 17th June, 2022, notice of motion was issued, the learned counsel appearing for U.T., Chandigarh accepted the notice on behalf of

respondents No.1 to 5. It was further directed that the respondent No.3 shall consider the representation dated 2nd June, 2022 within one week and take necessary steps so warranted to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

6. As per the office report, respondent Nos. 7 and 8 are not served.

7. The respondent Nos. 7 and 8 are not necessary party at this stage, as directions to official respondents are sought.

8. Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, APP, U.T., Chandigarh on instructions from ASI Sahab Singh submits that representation was considered, Sections 107 and 150 of Cr.P.C. were invoked against petitioner no.1 and respondent No.6. The contention is that in case petitioners approach to the police authorities in case of any threat perception, the same would be considered expeditiously in accordance with law.

9. Without commenting upon the merits of the case and on the allegations made in the representation, in view of the statement made by learned State counsel, no further directions are called for, the petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to avail remedies in accordance with law for redressal of grievance, if any.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

12th July, 2022

Parveen Sharma

Whether reasoned/speaking
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No