

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

**CRWP No. 8050 of 2022 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 25th August, 2022**

Kamla

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. R.S. Redhu, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

This petition is filed seeking directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of petitioner and her family members from the hands of respondents No. 6 and 7. Further direction is sought to Superintendent of Police, Hisar, to conduct fair and impartial inquiry of the complaints dated 6th June, 2022 and 27th June, 2022.

From the pleadings, it is forth coming that respondent No.7 is daughter-in-law of the petitioner and respondent No.6 is brother of respondent No.7. There is a dispute between the respondent No.7 and her in-laws with regard to transfer of land and for money to be invested for opening a liquor shop. There was an altercation between respondent No.7 and her husband, he left the house but with the intervention of respectables the matter was compromised.

On 6th June, 2022, the petitioner moved an application to Superintendent of Police, Hansi, alleging that respondent No.7, her brother and her mother were pressurizing the petitioner to transfer five acres of land in the name of respondent No.7 and to give Rs.20,00,000/- for opening the liquor shop. On refusal there were quarrels and threat was given by respondent No.7

No.7 made a call to her brother as there was fight between husband and wife. Fourteens persons tress-passed into the house and gave beatings to the son of the petitioner. It was claimed that there was a CCTV footage of the incident. Police was called, the complaint was investigated. The parties were summoned and preventive action under Section 107, 151 Cr.P.C. was taken by issuing a Kalandra.

Another complaint dated 27th June, 2022 was filed reiterating the allegations made in the complaint dated 6th June, 2002 and making further allegations that the Investigating Officer had colluded with the accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the police had taken no action against the accused. There is a threat to life and liberty of petitioner and her family.

Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that no legal remedy was availed against filing of complaint. There is no MLR of the son of the petitioner to substantiate the allegations that he sustained injuries.

The dispute is between the family members. In a quarrel between the husband and wife, the wife called her brother. There is nothing on record even to *prima-facie* substantiate the allegations of threat perception.

As per the law laid down by the Supreme Court in **Sakiri Vasu Versus State of U.P. 2008(2) SCC 409**, and **M.Subramaniam and anohter Vs. S. Janaki and another, 2020(2) AICLR 42**, the petitioner has an effective remedy, no interference is called for.

The petition is dismissed.

However, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law for redressal of surviving grievance, if any.

Since the main case has been dismissed, the pending application, if any is rendered infructuous.

25th August, 2022
reema

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

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