

2025:PHHC:029497



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

112

CRWP-1034-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 03.03.2025

Jito Devi**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Jagraj Singh Khiva, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Senior DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for issuance of directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the family of petitioner at the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5, as they are harassing and humiliating them and also implicating them in false cases.

2. Reply has been filed by the respondent-State. It is submitted therein and learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that on receipt of a complaint from one Roshan Lal regarding theft of his transformer, an FIR bearing No. 126 dated 02.05.2024 was registered under Section 136 of the Electricity Act at Police Station Guhla, Kaithal. During investigation of the said case, Vikram Singh @ Vikram, who is son of the present petitioner, and one Amandeep Singh @ Aman were arrested on 07.05.2024. During interrogation, they disclosed that Karan Singh and Raj Kumar @ Raju (husband of the petitioner) were also involved with them and that they had committed as many as

2025:PHHC:029497



151 thefts during the period from July, 2023 to May, 2024. On the basis of the same, Karan Singh and Raj Kumar @ Raju were also nominated in the aforesaid case. In pursuance of their disclosure statements, accused Raj Kumar, Karan Singh and Vikram Singh @ Vikram got recovered 300 kgs. of copper wire, 46 kgs. of rubber copper wire, a car make Swift, a motorcycle and cash amount of Rs. 6,000/- from their house, which was stolen from different places. It is argued that the family members of the petitioner are involved in number of theft cases and the investigation in those cases is going on. The allegations levelled by the petitioner regarding false implication are patently wrong and baseless. Therefore, it is, urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

3. Leaned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the fact that aforesaid cases have been registered against the family members of the petitioner and certain recoveries of stolen articles have also been effected from them.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case has been made out to issue any direction to the official respondents. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of.

03.03.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No