



306

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

CRWP-237-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 03.02.2025

PARVEEN

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. SP Soi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This is a petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a direction to official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family members by providing adequate protection to the petitioner and her family members and also directing the private respondents not to interfere in the personal life and liberty of the petitioner.

Status report by way of affidavit of Sanjeev Kumar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division City Batala, Police District Batala has been filed on behalf of the State Counsel, the same is taken on record. Copy of the same has been furnished to the counsel opposite. Along with the status report, statement of petitioner-Parveen is also annexed as Annexure R-1/T which reads as under :-



'Stated that I am resident of above mentioned address and practicing as Advocate in Punjab and Haryana High Court at Chandigarh. I had submitted a complaint against Vikramjit Singh Dhanjal S/o Jaswant Singh Dhanjal and Deepi wife of Vikramjit Singh Dhanjal residents of Jujhar Singh Nagar, near Tellianwal Batala, In this regard the abovesaid Vikramjit Singh Dhanjal S/o Jaswant Singh Dhanjal and Deepi W/o Vikramjit Singh Dhanjal residents of Jujhar Singh Nagar, Near Tellianwal Batala have apologized in writing for their mistake and have promised not to do such a mistake again. They agreed that if they do again will pay a fine of Rs.50,000/-. I agrees with this decision. As such she does not want to take any action on her complaint. My complaint should be filed to the office. Statement recorded after admitting it to be correct.'

A perusal of the aforesaid statement depicts that the parties have entered into compromise and agreed that if there is any threat again or misdeed, a fine of Rs. 50,000/- will be paid to her, as such the petitioner went on to state that she does not want to take any action against the private respondents.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the said statement is undated, shocking and surprising which is filed by the State Counsel with attestation of the DSP, Batala.

In view of the above, statement Annexure R-1/T seems to be of no consequence and without going into further in this issue, the respondent No.2- the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur is directed to consider and decide the representation dated 06.01.2025(Annexure P-2) by passing a speaking order in accordance



CRWP-237-2025

-3-

with law within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

A copy of order so passed be supplied to the petitioner within one week thereafter.

Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

03.02.2025
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>