

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-982-2024  
DECIDED ON: 06.03.2024

JYOTI AND ANOTHER  
.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS  
.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. This is a petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a direction to respondents No.2 & 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners by providing adequate protection to the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 to 9.
2. Status report filed by way of an affidavit dated 05.03.2024 of Sukhnaaz Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib is taken on record. The relevant part of the status report is reads as under:-

*“That the SHO, P.S Sirhind, after thoroughly inquiring the matter through ASI Jasvir Singh, submitted the inquiry report dated 02-03-2024 from which it transpired that during the inquiry the petitioner no.1 recorded her statement to the effect that her marriage was solemnized with respondent no.4 Moti Ram on 20-06-2020 according to their religious rites and ceremonies. A girl namely Harman was born out of this wedlock. Moti Ram is an alcoholic, who used to beat the petitioner no.1 Jyoti under the influence of alcohol. Due to this, the petitioner no.1 Jyoti, being upset by her husband, started living with*

*her friend i.e petitioner no.2 Md. Akval. Even presently, petitioner no.1 Jyoti and petitioner no.2 Md. Akval have been living together in a relationship in Sirhind for about 06 months and petitioner no.1 wanted to get a divorce from respondent no.4 Moti Ram. The petitioner no.1 Jyoti in her statement further averred that at present she and petitioner no.2 have no threat from the private respondents as the private respondents have no objection with the relationship of the petitioners, therefore, she doesn't want to proceed with her application. Likewise, the petitioner no.2 Md.Akval recorded his statement during the inquiry to the effect that respondent no.4 has neither threatened him nor has he ever come to Sirhind. He further stated that he and petitioner no.1 jyoti have no threat of any kind from the private respondents and the abovementioned application given by petitioner no.1, should be consigned. Therefore, the SHO, P.S Sirhind in his inquiry report concluded and recommended that no action has been required on the part of police authorities as there is no threat perception to the petitioners and the application is liable to be consigned to the record room. During the inquiry the Moti Ram has also been recorded his statement in the presence of his cousin Baljeet Singh to the effect that he has no objection on the relationship of petitioners. True translation of statement of petitioner no.1 Jyoti dated 01-03-2024 is Annexure R1/T. True translation of statement of petitioner no.2Md.Akval dated 01-03-2024 is Annexure R2/T.*

*That having agreed with the recommendation of SHO, P.S Sirhind, the deponent sent the report dated 02-03-2024 before the office of SSP, Fatehgarh Sahib with the recommendation to consign the application. Thereupon, the application no.137/OP dated 05-02-2024 has been consigned to the record room by the office of SSP, Fatehgarh Sahib on 04-03-2023. True translation of relevant portion of inquiry report of SHO dated 02-03- 2024 is Annexure R 3 / T.*

*6. That in view of facts and circumstances stated above it is submitted that at present, the petitioners have no threat perception of any kind, endangering their life and liberty at the hands of private respondents. Therefore, no further action has been required on the part of police*

*authorities. Nonetheless, it is respectfully submitted that the answering respondents are committed to adhering to any direction passed by this Hon'ble Court”.*

3. This Court is duly convinced that no threat perception exists to the lives and liberty of the petitioners, who themselves have made a statement before the police authorities with regard to the same. Hence, this petition does not warrant any order or inference whatsoever from this Court and the same is ordered to be dismissed being devoid of merits.

06.03.2024

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)  
JUDGE

Meenu

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