

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.: 120

CRWP No.3207 of 2025**Date of Decision: April 09, 2025**Madhu Bala & another

..... PETITIONER(S)

VERSUSState of Punjab & others

..... RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**PRESENT:** - Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (Oral)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent No.4.

In pursuance of order dated 01.04.2025, status report dated 08.04.2025 has been filed by way of affidavit of Aditya, IPS, SSP Gurdaspur, on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3. The same is taken on record. Paragraph Nos.3 to 8 of the affidavit are reproduced as under:

“3. That a specific report was sought from Public Complaint Branch Gurdaspur, SHO, Police Station Dorangla & SHO, Police Station Sadar Gurdaspur with regard to receipt of representation (P-1) from petitioners and all three i.e. Public Complaint Branch Gurdaspur, SHO, Police Station Dorangla & SHO, Police Station Sadar Gurdaspur submitted report that no representation (P-1) has been received in the office of Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, SHO, Police Station Dorangla or SHO, Police Station Sadar Gurdaspur made by petitioners.



4. That however, on receipt of copy of petition, ASI Satish Kumar of Police Station Dorangla was deputed to record grievance of petitioners by visiting house of petitioners. ASI Satish Kumar alongwith police party went to village of petitioners, but, house of petitioners was lying locked and none of family members were found present in the house. Thus, Panch of village namely Neelam wife of Harish Chander was contacted, who got recorded her statement that she had come to know that son of petitioners namely Rajinder Kumar had solemnized marriage and from last more than one month, they have not visited the village and whenever, they will visit village, she will inform police authorities. The true translated copy of Statement of Neelam (Panch of the village) is attached herewith as Annexure R-1/T.

5. That from Panch of village, Mobile No.82830-08377 of petitioner No.1 was taken, but, on dialing same was also found to be switched off and even efforts were made contact petitioners on mobile No.85821-87103 as mentioned in the petition, but, said number belonged to Sh. Pankaj, Advocate and thus, petitioner could not be contacted.

6. That thereafter, private respondents No.4 to 8 i.e. family members of Navjot Kaur (daughter-in-law of petitioners) were summoned and separate statements of respondents No.4 & 8 and joint statement of respondents No.5 to 7 were recorded, who had stated that on 24.02.2025, Navjot Kaur had gone to write her exam, but, did not return and later, they came to know that Navjot Kaur had solemnized marriage with Rajinder Kumar son of Nirmal Kumar and since then Navjot Kaur had not returned back home since 25.02.2025. They have never threatened any family member of Rajinder Kumar nor Navjot Kaur neither have interfered in their matrimonial life and will not interfere in their matrimonial life in future. With regard to protection of life & liberty, Rajinder Kumar &



Navjot Kaur had filed a petition pending before Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Pathankot and they have been summoned in said case for 23.04.2025, none of their family member have visited village of Rajinder Kumar on 23.03.2025 and extended threats. The true translated copies of Statement of respondents No.4 & 8 and Joint Statement of respondents No.5 to 7 are attached herewith as Annexures R-2/T & R-3/T respectively.

7. That efforts were made to contact the petitioners, but, enquiry officer was unable to reach out to petitioners, as they were not found present in their home at the place of their residence and known mobile number was found switched off and phone number mentioned on petition was not answered by petitioners, as it belonged to Sh. Pankaj, Advocate.

8. That directions have been issued to DSP, Dinanagar Gurdaspur, SHO, Police Station Sadar Gurdaspur and SHO, Police Station Dorangla to ensure that no harm in any manner is caused to petitioners or their family members at the hands of private respondents and ensure round the clock presence of PCR vehicles in village of petitioners to thwart any untoward incident.”

In view of the above, no cause of action survives in the present petition and the same is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
Judge

April 09, 2025
avin

Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/ No
Yes/ No