



107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1083-2025
Date of decision: 03.02.2025

ASHU DEVI

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. G. S. Randhawa, Advocate for
Mr. Gursimran Singh Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing official respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and also directing private respondents No.4 to 8 not to interfere in the personal life and liberty of the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that a representation (Annexure P-2) was given to the respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot but no action has been taken by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot on the same till date and therefore, a direction may be issued to the police authorities to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 8.

3. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner.



4. The prayer in the present petition is to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 8. However, a perusal of Annexure P-2, which is purported to be a representation would show that the same is dated 27.01.2025 and it was sent by way of e-mail on 29.01.2025, which is so depicted in page No.22 of the paper-book and the present petition has been filed on 30.01.2025, just after one day. Not only this, there is nothing on the record to show that as to whether actually the aforesaid representation (Annexure P-2) was given to the police by any other mode or not because no other mode of proof has been attached nor it has been stated in the petition.

5. It is a settled law that in case any complaint is made to the police and the police is not entertaining the complaint then the complainant is always at liberty to make a complaint to the concerned Head of the District by way of a registered post but straightaway at the drop of a hat just after one day of sending complaint by e-mail, the complainant cannot approach the High Court for seeking a direction. It appears in the present case from the aforesaid chronology of the dates that the petitioner has filed the present petition at the drop of a hat.

6. Consequently, the present writ petition is hereby dismissed being premature. However, in case in future the petitioner actually has any threat to her life and liberty, then she may always approach the concerned police authorities by filing an appropriate application in proper mode by way of a registered post.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

03.02.2025
Chetan Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No