



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

CRWP-4230-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:28.04.2025

Nidhi Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Jogendra Pundir, Advocate for
Mr. Vikramjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by the petitioner who is a lady seeking protection of her life and liberty from the private respondents, who are her father-in-law, mother-in-law and husband.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that while referring to para Nos.3 and 4 of the petition that the respondent No.6-husband is a drug addict and used to beat the petitioner. There are two minor daughters born out of the wedlock who are under the care and custody of the petitioner and it was always the objection of the private respondents that a son should have been born instead of daughters. He further submitted that the petitioner was also forcibly made to undergo abortions. He also asserted that there is now a threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner from the private respondents and she is presently living separately at different locations to protect herself.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 to 3.
5. At this stage, Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.4 to 6 and has filed his Power of Attorney which is taken on record.
6. Learned State counsel stated that the threat perception of the petitioner has been verified and the statements of respondents No.4 to 6 were recorded at the police station in Jind, wherein they stated that they will not cause any threat to the petitioner. Therefore, according to the police of District Jind, there is no threat perception.
7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.4 to 6 submitted that respondents No.4 and 6, who are the father-in-law and husband of the petitioner, are present in Court today. He has specific instructions to state that they have never caused any threat to the petitioner, nor will they cause any kind of threat whatsoever to the petitioner in future. He also submitted that since they are present in Court today, he has specific instructions to state that they undertake not to cause any threat to the petitioner at any stage.
8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, in view of the categorical statements made by learned counsel for respondents No.4 to 6 and learned State counsel, and also in view of the undertaking given by respondents No.4 to 6, the present petition may be disposed of
9. Disposed of accordingly.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE