

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

120/5

CRWP No.2906 of 2024

Date of Decision: 05.04.2024

Jayda and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Nafeesh Ahmed, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking direction to respondents No.1 to 3 for protection of life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 to 8.

Learned State counsel has produced the copy of the statement made by Jayda as well as Mohd. Hussain, petitioners No.1 and 2 respectively wherein both the petitioners are categorically stated that they were earlier kept at safe house by the police line, Nuh and now they do not have any threat to their life and hence, they do not want to press the instant petition any further.

Learned State counsel also informed the Court that in FIR No.94 dated 04.04.2024 has been got lodged by Jayda alleging an incident of 24.03.2024 against her own son namely Akram from her first marriage with one Jakir stating that Akram-son has given beatings when she refused to pay some money as demanded by Akram. That FIR is pending investigation with the concerned police station to which this Court has not concern at this stage.

As far as want of protection as enumerated in the petition is concerned, the statement made by both the petitioners produced by learned

State counsel which is crystal clear that they do not want any kind of protection as no inclination to pursue the present petition.

Having no merits in the allegations levelled before this Court *qua* the threat perceptions to the petitioner’s life and liberty, this Court do not find any reason for invoking the Article 226 of the Constitution of India for providing them any further protection.

Before parting with this order, this Court also cannot shut its eyes to the facts brought fourth by the learned State counsel that both the petitioners are already married as petitioner No.1 is having 7 children whereas petitioner No.2 is father of five children from his first marriage who is also having living spouse.

Faced with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner prays to withdraw the instant petition, at this stage.

Prayer is accepted.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

05.04.2024
D.Bansal

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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