

CRWP-578-2024
Date of decision: 20.01.2024

Meena Rani and anotherPetitioners

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Lt. Col. P.K. Saran, Advocate and
Mr. Shantnu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sidakmeet Singh Sandhu, Addl.P.P.,
for the respondent-U.T. Chandigarh.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

The criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing respondents No.1 to 4 to provide adequate protection for the life and liberty of the petitioners who are apprehending imminent danger to their lives at the hands of respondents No.5 & 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that respondent No.7 is the son of the petitioners and he is a drug addict and the petitioners have disowned him on 20.02.2019 by getting an advertisement published in the newspaper (Annexures P-1 & P-2). Respondents No.5 & 7 are claiming themselves to be in love with each other and the act & conduct of private respondents is bringing disrepute to the petitioners. Respondent No.5 is draining respondent No.7 financially. They are indulging into the acts of begging, borrowing & stealing and people are approaching the petitioners for

CRWP-578-2024

-2-

recovery of money borrowed by respondents No.5 & 7 and they are facing harassment on daily basis. On 14.08.2023, respondent No.5 entered the house of the petitioners and dialled police help No.112 and the petitioners in order to avoid any scene in the neighbourhood, has paid Rs.5,000/- to respondent No.5. Thereafter, a complaint was made by respondent No.5 before the S.P. Window at Chandigarh regarding which petitioners were summoned by the police and their statements were recorded. During inquiry, it came to the knowledge of the petitioners that respondent No.5 is reportedly married to respondent No.7.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners and after perusing the record, it appears that there is a dispute between the petitioners and their son, therefore, no circumstance exists which warrants any interference by this Court and as such, the present petition is dismissed being devoid of any merit. However, the petitioners would be at liberty to invoke their alternative remedy as available to them in accordance with law.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

20.01.2024

Neha

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