

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

243

CRM-M-38831-2019

Date of Decision: November 16, 2022

DARO BEGAM

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

The present petition has been filed under Article 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 7.

Notice of motion was issued in this case on 13.09.2019. Pursuant to which reply 02.12.2019 had been filed. Learned State counsel makes a reference to para Nos.14, 17 and 21, which reads thus:-

“14. That in reply to the contents of Para No. 14 of the petition, it is submitted that the complaint dated 10.07.2019 filed by the petitioner against respondent No.5 has been sent to SHO PS Panjokhara vide complaint No. 2099-PW dated 11.07.2019 and the matter was enquired into by SHO. It is submitted that on 16.07.2019, both the parties were summoned in the police station and the statement of the petitioner, Bala D/o petitioner are recorded on behalf of the complainant/petitioner, whereas, respondent No. 5 Jas Pal Singh son of Sh. Jangsher, Shamina respondent No.4 (daughter-in-law of petitioner and wife of deceased Raj Kumar), Mam Raj son of Bishna Ram (Sarpanch of Village Jatwar) and Gulzar Singh son of Sh. Bachan Singh (Panch) have been recorded. As per the statements of Sarpanch and Panch of the village, the enquiry officer

CRM-M-38831-2019

:2:

found that the petitioner has moved a false complaint against the respondent No.4 to 7 and the allegations levelled in the complaint were found to be false and further requested to file the complaint vide his report dated 07.10.2018 and thereafter, the complaint of the petitioner have been ordered to be field vide order dated 11.10.2019 by the orders of answering respondent.

17. That the contents of Para No.17 of the petition are wrong hence vehemently denied. It is submitted that the petitioner has no threat or danger to her life and liberty at the hands of respondent No.4 to 7.

21. That in reply to the contents of Para No. 21 of the petition, it is submitted that the answering respondent and the local police are doing their official duty in accordance with the law and the petitioner has no threat to her life and liberty at the hands of the respondent No. 4 to 7 as enquired into by the SHO PS Panjokhara. Moreover, the petitioner is not residing in the jurisdiction of District Ambala rather she is residing with her daughter in District Patiala for last 1-1.5 years."

Learned State counsel submits that there is no threat which was found to the life and liberty of the petitioner and the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

In view of the above, no further order is required to be passed in the matter. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

November 16, 2022
rimpal

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No