



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107

CRWP-10355-2024

Date of decision: 25.10.2024

Rani Devi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Rishav Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family at the hands of respondents No.4 and 5, who are threatening the petitioner, and take legal action/register an FIR against them in accordance with law on her representations dated 31.08.2024 and 19.10.2024 (Annexures P-4 and P-5).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had handed over 40 grams of gold to the private respondents, who are jewellers, for converting it into gold bangles, vide receipt Annexure P-1 dated 11.06.2024. It was undertaken by the private respondents that gold bangles would be readied and handed over to the petitioner on 14.06.2024. However, the petitioner later realized that she has been taken for a ride and a fraud had been played upon her; despite her repeated attempts and efforts to get back the gold bangles, the private respondent had initially been putting off the matter and lateron they blankly refused to hand over the same. Hence, the



CRWP-10355-2024

-2-

petitioner, left with no other option, moved a complaint to respondent No.3 annexed as Annexure P-4 on 31.08.2024 which was followed by representation Annexure P-5 to respondent No.2 on 19.10.2024. The official respondents had till date not initiated any action under the law against the private respondents. A prayer has, therefore, been made for issuance of appropriate directions to the official respondents, to look into representation dated 19.10.2024 (Annexure P-5), decide the same in the light of *Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh & Ors. : 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 979*, and take appropriate steps.

3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. In the wake of the limited prayer of the petitioner, the instant petition is disposed of and respondent No.2 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur, is directed to look into the representation of the petitioner, decide the same at the earliest and take appropriate steps, if any required, under the provisions of law. However, if respondent No.2 does not find any substance in the allegations levelled in the representation (Annexure P-5), then the petitioner shall be duly informed as per the parameters laid down by the Supreme Court in *Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh & Ors. : 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 979*.

25.10.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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