

115 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-7299-2020
Date of Decision: 10.03.2022

JASPREET KAUR @ GURBHEJ KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate
for respondents No.4 and 5.

Case heard via video-conferencing.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

On 17.09.2020, i.e. almost 1½ years ago, the following order
was passed by this Court :-

*“ The case has been taken up for hearing through
video conferencing.*

*The petitioner has filed present petition under
Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of
directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect her life and
liberty from danger at the hands of respondents No.4 and 5.*

Notice of motion.

*Pursuant to supply of advance copy of the petition,
Mr. Harbir Sandhu, Asstt. AG, Punjab has appeared and
accepted notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.*

*Learned State Counsel seeks time to complete his
instructions.*

Adjourned to 13.10.2020.

*Notices to respondents No.4 and 5 be issued for
that date and notices be also given dasti, if so desired.*

*The petitioner is directed to remain present on the
next date of hearing through video conferencing.*

*In the meanwhile, respondent No.2-Senior
Superintendent of Police, Fazilka is directed to look into the
grievances of the petitioner as set out in the petition and*

also expressed in the representation dated 09.07.2020 (Annexure P-1) and take appropriate action for protection of her life and liberty as may be warranted by the circumstances.

Registry is directed to send a copy of this order along with copy of the petition and above-said representation to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka for requisite compliance.”

Thereafter a reply having been filed by the respondent-State, dated 14.10.2020, none appeared for the petitioner for three consecutive dates, from 14.12.2020 to 15.02.2022.

Today also, counsel for the petitioner has not even attempted to join the video-conference as per the coordinator of the video-conference.

Consequently, looking at the reply filed on behalf of the respondent-State by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Abohar, to the effect that there is a matrimonial dispute ongoing between the petitioner and respondents No.4 and 5 (i.e. her husband and father-in-law), with there also being litigation qua the custody of their child, obviously the petitioner is not interested in pursuing this petition after the reply has been filed.

Dismissed for want of prosecution.

March 10, 2022

gurpreet

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes

Whether reportable:

No