



CRWP-8614-2024
106 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-8614-2024
Date of Decision:06.09.2024

Kiranjot Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sham Lal Saha, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Swati Batra, DAG, Punjab (Through VC).

Mr. Amandeep Sharma, Advocate
for the private respondents.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

Apprehending threat to their lives and liberty at the hands of the private respondents, the petitioners have come up before this Court seeking protection through the State, by invoking their fundamental rights of life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

2. Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order, this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondents is required nor exists any requirement to issue notices to the private respondents.

3. Mr. Amandeep Sharma, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the private respondents and handed over photocopy of Aadhar Card of petitioner No.1, in which her date of birth is mentioned as 17.04.2008.

4. If the allegations of apprehension of threat to their lives turn out to be true, it might lead to an irreversible loss. Thus, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it shall be appropriate that the concerned Superintendent of Police, SHO, or any officer to whom such powers have been delegated or have been authorized in this regard, provide appropriate protection to the petitioners for one week from today.



CRWP-8614-2024

However, if the petitioners no longer require the protection, then at their request it may be discontinued even before the expiry of one week. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities or upon the oral or written request of the petitioners.

5. The protection is subject to the stringent condition that from the time such protection is given, the petitioners shall refrain from attending parties, bars, picnics or any area that may pose a risk to their life. The SHO should send police officer(s) to petitioners' home to assess the required level of security. Once the assessment is done, the officer should provide adequate security without the petitioners having to contact them.

6. It is clarified that if the petitioners visit any disputed place and the security officer becomes aware of it, they should advise the petitioners to avoid going there. If the petitioners still insist on going, the officer has the right to return to the police station due to petitioners' defiance of the order.

7. Counsel for the petitioners to direct the petitioners to attend the phone call(s) of the Investigator. As far as the petitioner No.1 is concerned, being a minor girl (as per the document given by private respondents) as soon as the Investigator contacts her, he shall produce the girl to the nearest Judicial Magistrate and in case the time is not suitable immediately before a Child Protection Home and after that produce her before the concerned Judicial Magistrate. The concerned Judicial Magistrate shall interact with her and it is the concerned Magistrate's discretion whether to record her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C or to proceed without that.

8. It is clarified that if petitioner No.1 is found minor, learned Judicial Magistrate will either send the minor to Child Protection Home or to her parents as per the result of the interaction with her, but if she is found major, then shall proceed in accordance with law. The identity of the place where petitioners are staying shall not be revealed to the private respondents.

9. **It is made clear that if petitioner No.1 is found minor, her custody shall NOT be handed over to the adult petitioner No.2.** It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits. It is also clarified that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR for the petitioners. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the



CRWP-8614-2024

interrogation of petitioner No.2 is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for petitioner No.2 to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

10. **This order shall eclipse after fifteen days from today.**

11. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order, and any Advocate for the Petitioner and State can download this order and other relevant particulars from the official web page of this court and attest it to be a true copy. The concerned officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for immediate use.*

Petition is allowed to the extent mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

06.09.2024
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.