



CRWP No.10771 of 2024

105

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No. 10771 of 2024

Date of Decision: 11.11.2024

Sarabjit Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukhdev Singh, 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. Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order that this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondents nor the issuance of notices to the private respondents is required. State counsel submits that the present petition is not maintainable as petitioner No.2 is stated to be in custody of respondent No.4.

3. 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 on the basis of day to day analysis. It is clarified that separate protection shall be assessed for the petitioners and shall be provided where they are residing currently, if any requirement of protection is made out.

4. This protection for petitioner No.1 is subject to the stringent condition that from the time such protection is given, the petitioner No.1 shall not go outside the boundaries of the place of residence, except for medical necessities, to buy household necessities and for bereavements in the families of the close relatives or close friends.



CRWP No.10771 of 2024

This restriction saves the petitioner No.1 from apprehended risk and ensures that the protection is not flaunted.

5. 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 petitioner No.1 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.

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

7. 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 Senior Superintendent of Police wants to provide any further security, he/she may provide at his/her own level and not based on the order of this Court.

8. *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

11.11.2024
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No.