



CRWP No.12389 of 2024

162 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No.12389 of 2024
Date of Decision: 20.12.2024

Parveen Kumari ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and Others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Nitish Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Swati Batra, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

Apprehending threat to their life and liberty at the hands of the private respondents and seeking directions to respondent Nos.2 and 4, the petitioner has come up before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in the nature of *mandamus*.

2. Notices are served upon the official respondent(s) through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order that this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondent(s) nor the issuance of notices to the private respondent(s) is required.

3. Counsel for the State opposes the present petition on the ground that in the representation (Annexure P-3), the petitioner also mentions about dispute of ownership and possession of land which is not under the jurisdiction of police authority concerned.

4. At this stage, counsel for the petitioner wants to withdraw the present petition with liberty reserved to the petitioner to file fresh representation to the concerned Senior Superintendent of Police/ Commissioner of Police confining his prayer to protection of his life and liberty.

5. Given above, in case such a representation is filed within a period of 15 days, the same shall be decided by the concerned Senior Superintendent of Police, within two months, either himself/herself or by authorizing and delegating it to any officer holding IPS cadre, within a period of 30 days of filing of such representation. It is clarified that such order must be a reasoned order, and the same be communicated to the representationist on email ID of the petitioner as well as that of his/her counsel, if provided in the representation itself, without delay .

2024.PHHC.171677



CRWP No.12389 of 2024

- 6. This order shall eclipse after a period of 15 days in case such a representation is not filed by the petitioner.
- 7. Liberty reserved to the petitioners to file fresh petition or to take other legal remedies in accordance with the law.
- 8. It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the petitioners are required for interrogation in any cognizable case.
- 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 allowed to the extent mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

20.12.2024
Sonia Puri

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.