

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

206

**CRWP-7535-2020
Date of decision: 11.02.2022**

HARWINDER SINGH AND OTHERS

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present : Mr. Mohd. Salim, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. A.K. Khurana, DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ. J. (ORAL)

This case has been taken up through Video Conferencing via Webex facility in the light of Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

Instant petition had been filed seeking directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondent No.5, who is alleged to have filed false and frivolous applications/complaints against the petitioners.

Pursuant to the directions issued to the State, reply by way of an affidavit of Paramjit Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Dhuri, District Sangrur has been filed on behalf of respondent-State and it is stated as under:-

'3. That Harwinder Singh (petitioner No.1) had moved another application before SSP Sangrur that action be taken and case be registered against Manjit Kaur (respondent No.5) and Murti Devi Wife of Hem Raj resident of Salemgarh Tehsil Moonak. Regarding the complaint of Harwinder Singh (petitioner No.1) the inquiry was conducted by Superintendent Police (Investigation) and recommended for consigning the

same. Superintendent Police (Investigation) Sangrur had sent his report dated 26.11.2020 to SSP Sangrur. The same has been approved by SSP Sangrur.

4. That now no complaint is pending before respondent Nos.1 to 4 with regard to the parties of the present petition.

5. That as per record the representation dated 02.09.2020 (Annexure P-3) has never been given by the petitioners before SSP Sangrur. There is no receipt no. of the application in the office of SSP Sangrur. It is a false creation just to file the present petition. However there is no apprehension to the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondent No.5, as the petitioners and respondent No.5 are living separately.'

In view of the submissions contained in the reply filed by the State, learned counsel for the petitioners does not press the instant petition.

Dismissed as not pressed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

February 11, 2022

S.Sharma(syr)

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>