



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

206(1)

CRWP-15-2025

Decided On: 09.09.2025

ASHA DEVI

....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Ashir Gulati, Advocate and
Mr. Tarun Deora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sartaj Singh Gill, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Parvinder Singh, Advocate
for respondents no.5 to 7.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a direction to respondents no.1 to 3 to protect the petitioner's life and liberty as respondent no.4 along with police party have been raiding her house, wherein her personal properties including CCTV Cameras, DVR, etc. have been taken away.

2. Learned State counsel has referred to status report dated 13.02.2025, filed on behalf of respondents no.1, 3 and 4 by way of affidavit of Mr. Inderpal Chohan, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Circle Patran, District Patiala, which is to the following effect:

7. That all the allegations levelled in the petition regarding took away 4 CCTV cameras, DVR, two WIFI modems along with gold bracelets etc. are totally false and frivolous and there is not an iota of truth in it.




8. That as far as regarding the threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner is concerned, the Senior Superintendent of Police Patiala vide his order no.4611-13/CAW dated 25.01.2025 directed the deponent to assess the prescription to the life and personal liberty of the petitioner. Hence, the deponent deputed SHO PS Shutrana to submit report. SHO PS Shutrana went to the house of petitioner in Village Karim Nagar and also joined Kulwant Singh Sarpanch of the Village along with Namberdar Surjit Ram, and other respectable persons of the village, but the house of petitioner was found locked and none of the family member were available. Statements of respectables were recorded and they disclosed that from dated 31.12.2024 the petitioner and her husband Gurcharn Ram etc. are not residing in the village and the respectable joined were apprised about the orders of the Hon'ble High Court and advised them to inform the police as and when the petitioner came back to the village. Hence, SHO PS Shutrana recommended for consigning the petition to record room.

Accordingly, he contends that the petitioner is not even residing at the given address, and her allegations regarding taking away of CCTV cameras, DVR, etc. are also false.

3. The facts have not been disputed by the petitioner by filing any counter-affidavit.

4. It is apparent that allegations in the petition against the respondents regarding taking away the DVR etc. have not even been *prima facie* established, nor could the threat to her life and liberty be assessed as her whereabouts are not known.

5. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of with liberty to the petitioner that in case she apprehends threat to her life and liberty in future, it can be brought to the notice of third respondent/Senior Superintendent of



Police, Patiala, who will take appropriate action in the matter, in accordance with law.

09.09.2025
Ad

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No