



CRWP-6049-2025

1

116

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

**CRWP-6049-2025  
DECIDED ON: 24.09.2025**

**Rajni****.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**State of Punjab and others****.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)**

1. By way of present petition, petitioner-Rajni aged 58 years, has sought protection by alleging that she was married to respondent No.8-Ramsunder Dass, who infact is now Mahant of a dera Sh. Baba Lal Ji at Dhianpur Batala.

2. Two status reports have been filed by the respondent/State on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 and respondent No. 4. In the status report filed on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3, paragraph No. 7 states that the grievance of the petitioner can, infact, be addressed by the concerned police authorities in District Batala. However, the Amritsar police have already advised the petitioner that if she feels any threat from the private respondents, she should immediately contact the police personnel of the relevant PCR vehicle on the provided mobile numbers. Additionally, whenever she visits Batala, she is instructed to contact the local police.



3. In another status report dated 10.09.2025, filed on behalf of respondent No. 4, paragraphs 4 to 7 contain the following details:

*“4. That the deponent submits that in the aforesaid proceedings, a status report in the form of an Affidavit, was submitted by the then Senior Superintendent of Police, Batala and affirmed before this Hon'ble Court that directions had been issued to ensure foolproof and adequate security arrangements by the SHO, Police Station Kotli Surat Malli, and the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Dera Baba Nanak, for safeguarding the life and liberty of the petitioners, upon their requisition, whenever they enters into the jurisdiction of Police District Batala. It was further stated that the official contact numbers of the aforesaid officers, as well as of the Control Room, Batala, had been provided to the petitioners so as to enable them to seek immediate police assistance in case of any security requirement.*

*5. That the deponent submits that the aforementioned undertaking given by the then Senior Superintendent of Police, Batala has been scrupulously complied with by Batala Police. Further, on every occasion when the petitioner or her son entered the jurisdiction of Police District Batala and made a requisition, appropriate security arrangements were duly extended to them in accordance with the aforesaid affidavit filed before this Hon'ble Court.*

*6. That the deponent submits that, the petitioner has instituted a private complaint before the Court of the Ld. JMIC, Batala, registered as COMI No. 98 of 2024, wherein, vide an order dated 14.08.2025, Respondent No. 8 has been summoned to stand trial for the offence punishable under Section 493 of the IPC 1860. The said complaint is presently pending adjudication before the Ld. Trial Court at Batala.*

*7. That the deponent submits that in deference to the undertaking earlier submitted before this Hon'ble Court, and keeping in view of the pendency of the aforesaid criminal case, necessary directions have been issued by the deponent to the SHO, Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, to make adequate and*



*effective security arrangements for the petitioner whenever she visits Batala, particularly on the occasions of her appearance before the Ld. JMIC, Batala, subject to her requisition. The official contact details of the said SHO have also been communicated to the petitioner so as to enable her to seek immediate police assistance in the event of any security requirement.”*

4. The apprehension expressed by the petitioner regarding the need for security cover has already been acknowledged, and the concerned respondent/State has addressed this in the status reports. Furthermore, with regard to the question of whether respondent No. 8 holds the position of Mahant, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Batala, by order dated 14.08.2025, has issued summons to respondent No. 8 to face proceedings in COMI No. 98 of 2024, initiated under Section 493 of the IPC.

5. In view of the stand taken by the respective official respondents, this Court does not find any sufficient reason to issue specific directions concerning the prayer made by the petitioner in the instant petition. Accordingly, petition is disposed of.

6. However, it is expected that the respondents will periodically review and address the petitioner’s security concerns whenever she moves out, including while attending Courts at Batala.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

24.09.2025  
Rashmi

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