



108

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

**CRWP-8070-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 30.07.2025**

POONAM DEVI AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Ms. Aarti Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).
Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This is a petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a direction to official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner by providing adequate protection to the petitioner and also directing the private respondents not to interfere in the personal life and liberty of the petitioner.

Explanation by way of affidavit of Ganga Ram Punia, IPS, Superintendent of Police, Karnal in compliance of order dated 28.07.2025, has been filed by learned State Counsel, the same is taken on record. Copy of the same has been furnished to the counsel opposite.

‘That, after receipt of order dated 28.07.2025 passed by this Hon'ble court; it was found that representation dated 21.07.2025 has not been received on official e-mail ID -spkrl@hry.nic.in on 21.07.2025 as claimed by petitioners in petition. Further, sender's e-mail address aartiadvchd@gmail.com was also checked in NIC mail box of official e-mail ID of SP/Karnal to ascertain whether any e-mail has been received

from this e-mail address as claimed. It was found that no such e-mail was received from this e-mail ID.'

A perusal of the case file shows that the email address of the respondent No.2 SSP Karnal on the representation sent by the petitioner duly matches with the e-mail ID mentioned in the reply filed by the State and the same was sent at 10:16 PM on 21.07.2025.

In light of the above, the assertion made in the affidavit seems to be false and do not inspire confidence of this Court added with the fact that email address is also the same as is evident from page 18 of the paper book I.e serving receipt attached by the petitioner.

However, though without going into the merits of the case, the representation dated 21.07.2025 is stated to be considered and decided. Paragraph No. 3 deposes that Poonam Devi and Shashikant got married on 07.12.2024 out of their own free will, however after the marriage they had a dispute after which the petitioner Poonam returned back to her parental home. Later on, she volutarily rejoined her husband and they are presently living outside Karnal and has sent statement through Whatsapp. Further, family of the petitioners give statements to the effect that they do not have any objection to their marriage and do not pose any threat to the petitioner or her husband.

In light of the above, nothing remains in the present petition, hence, the same is dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

30.07.2025
anuradha

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