



CRWP No.10382 of 2024

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

CRWP No. 10382 of 2024
Date of Decision: 14.11.2024

Balwinder Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. R.D. Rattewal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

Apprehending for life and liberty at the hands of the private respondents, the petitioners, invoking the fundamental right of life guaranteed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, have come up before this Court seeking protection through the State.

2. Reply filed by State counsel is taken on record.
3. Given the nature of the order that this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of private respondents nor the issuance of notices to them is required.
4. The concerned SHO to assess threat perception of the petitioners. If the concerned SHO finds threat perception to be true, then he may provide protection to the petitioner on the basis of day to day analysis.
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.

**CRWP No.10382 of 2024**

6. It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits and that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation of the petitioners is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for the petitioners to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

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

8. Since this order shall eclipse after fifteen days, therefore, if any PSO is deputed, in that case the concerned PSO shall also return back. After that, if the concerned officer wants to provide any further security, he/she may provide at his/her own level and not based on the order of this Court.

9. *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 disposed of to the extent mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

14.11.2024
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No.