

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

CRWP No.5832 of 2024
Date of Decision: 02.08.2024

Sukhdeep Kaur ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate (Through VC)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

*** * * ***


ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

Apprehending threat to her life and liberty at the hands of the respondents No.3 & 4, the petitioner, invoking the fundamental right of life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, has come up before this Court seeking protection through the State.

2. In compliance to the previous orders, State has filed Status report and the same is taken on record.

3. Since there are allegations against respondent No.3-concerned Inspector, it would be appropriate to refer to para 6 of the reply, which reads as under:-

“That it is further submitted that so far as the contentions raised by the petitioner in the present petition that respondent No.3, Inspector Manjit Singh fully assisted the accused persons in this incident with the help of unknown Police Officials and till today petitioner has not received any response from the Police Officials are concerned, it is submitted that as per the detailed facts submitted hereinabove, except the due course of law, the respondent No.3 has no concern whatsoever either with petitioner or with private respondent. With regard to the incident dated 13.06.2024, respondent No.4 had moved an application No.700 Dasti to SHO, Police Station Amargarh on 16.06.2024 and the petitioner has never



CRWP No.5832 of 2024

appeared before SHO, Police Station Amargarh to join the inquiry proceedings. Due to compromise between both the parties i.e. the petitioner and respondent No.4, this application has also been consigned to the record room.

7. That it is most respectfully submitted that the answering respondents are always there to assist and protect the petitioner in case of any misuse of law by the private respondent. Hence, the present petition may kindly be dismissed, qua the answering respondents, in the interest of justice.”

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that given the reply filed by the concerned DySP, he wants to withdraw the present petition with liberty to file a fresh in case she apprehends any threat perception.

Petition is disposed of as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

02.08.2024
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.