

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
At Chandigarh**

CRWP-2366-2024 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-19.3.2024

Dr. Kanu Sharma ... Petitioner  
Versus  
State of U.T., Chandigarh and others ... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Ms. Malkit Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.  
  
Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T., Chandigarh with  
Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate and  
Ms. Diksha Sharma, Advocate.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)**

1. Petitioner – Dr. Kanu Sharma, who is a practising Lawyer in this Court, seeks issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect her life and liberty as she apprehends threat to the same at the hands of respondent No.7 – Vikas Malik, who is stated to be President of High Court Bar Association, and respondent No.8 – Anil Bansal, who is stated to be a practising Lawyer.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a dispute arose on 26.2.2024 on account of allotment of seats to some lady Lawyers, which were allotted by the current Vice-President, Secretary and Joint Secretary of Bar Association, but since the same had been allotted in the absence of the President i.e. respondent No.7 – Vikas Malik, he nurses a grudge and had demolished the cabins set up by the lady members of the Bar. It has been submitted that the petitioner and other lady Lawyers had been protesting

against such action, but respondent No.7 rather chose to issue threats to cause harm to the petitioner and to other lady members of the bar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent No.7 is also pressurizing the petitioner to withdraw the complaint, which the petitioner had submitted before the Bar Council against his conduct. It has further been submitted that there have been several other instances of the petitioner having issued threats by respondent No.7 and, as such, she seriously apprehends that respondents No.7 and 8, who are influential persons, will cause harm to the petitioner.
4. Notice of motion.
5. At this stage, Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T., Chandigarh, upon whom an advance copy of petition had already been served, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent – State of U.T., Chandigarh.
6. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, but without commenting anything as regards veracity of averments made in the petition, the instant petition is disposed off with a direction to respondent No.6 – Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh to look into the matter and to get the representation dated 6.3.2024 (Annexure P-4) examined qua the alleged threat perception of the petitioner. In case, it is found that there is any genuine threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner, then necessary steps, as warranted under law be taken thereupon so as to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioner.

**19.3.2024**

pankaj

**( Gurvinder Singh Gill )  
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No