



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRWP-9157-2023(O&M)
Decided on : 04.02.2025

GEETA PANCHAL . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

PRESENT: Ms. Jyoti Kumari, Advocate for
Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S.Thind, DAG Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

By way of instant petition, petitioner has approached this Court for issuance of directions to respondents No.1 to 3 for protection life and liberty of the petitioner, from the hands of private respondents No.4 to 7.

2. At the very outset, learned State counsel while referring to Paragraphs No.4 and 5 of Status report dated 27.07.2024 submits that multiple complaints were filed by the petitioner before SSP Mohali against Respondents No. 4 to 7. The details of these complaints are as follows:

Sr. No.	Complaint No.	Dated
1	704/P/SSP	16.02.2023
2	3360/Special/SSP	11.04.2023
3	1795/P/SSP	19.04.2023
4	258/P.G.O	09.05.2023

3. The said complaints were duly marked to SHO, Police Station Women, Mohali, for enquiry. However, the officials of PS Women, Mohali, repeatedly contacted the petitioner on the mobile number provided by her, to join the enquiry. Despite repeated calls from the police officials, the petitioner kept her mobile phone switched off. Subsequently, a summons under Section 160 Cr.P.C. was issued, directing her to appear on 20.10.2023 with documentary evidence and witnesses, but she did not appear. It is

**CRWP-9157-2023(O&M)****- 2 -**

further submitted that the petitioner had originally filed complaints regarding harassment and physical abuse by her in-laws but never reported any imminent threat to her life and liberty. Respondents No. 2 and 3 have always been willing to provide protection, yet the petitioner has failed to participate in the enquiry. During the investigation of complaints filed earlier, it was revealed that an FIR No. 46 dated 19.04.2021 under Sections 323, 354-D, 406, and 498-A IPC was already registered at Police Station Women, District Karnal, against her husband Neeraj Kumar (respondent No.4). Since action had already been taken, the police closed the complaints to avoid double jeopardy, as proceeding twice on the same offence is impermissible under the law.

4. In view of above, nothing survives in the present petition and the same is disposed of as infructuous.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

04.02.2025

Kavita

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*Whether Reportable:* Yes/No