

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

CRWP-312-2024

Date of Decision : **15.03.2024**

KARAMJIT KAUR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr.Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, prayer has been made by the petitioner for issuance of a writ of '*mandamus*' upon the official respondents no.2 and 3 to protect her life and liberty as the official respondent no.3, i.e. the SHO, Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra, is unnecessarily harassing and trespassing in petitioner's house, without any reasons, and further to issue a direction to save the life and liberty of the petitioner, as one of the persons namely Geetanjali, who is stated to be an influential lady, can create any sort of mishappening for the petitioner.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 12.01.2024, this Court directed the State to file a reply to the instant petition. A short reply by way of an affidavit of Sh.Randhir Singh, DSP, Shahabad, Kurukshetra, has been filed, which is taken on record.

3. As per the reply, on a complaint of one Geetanjali, an FIR

bearing No.350, dated 06.06.2023, under Sections 406 and 420 of the IPC and under Sections 10 and 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra, has been registered against Davinder Rajpal, Harpreet, Harkishan, Saiyad Rashid, Abass and Bharat.

4. The reply further makes revelation that during investigation, son of the present petitioner, Davinder Rajpal, was also arrested in the FIR (*supra*), on 25.01.2024, and recovery of Rs.2,000/- was also effected from him. It is also clarified from the reply that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case and she is not required for any further inquiry or investigation, and infact, the instant petition has been filed just to create defence for her son and accused in the above FIR, and there is no truth in the allegation, regarding any apprehension to her life and liberty.

5. In view of the specific reply, and considering the fact that the petition is based on vague pleas, which has not been corroborated with any of the evidence to substantiate the pleas, this Court does not find any ground to issue any direction, as sought through the instant petition.

6. Consequently, the instant petition, is **dismissed**.

March 15, 2024
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No