



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

222

CRWP-9961-2024

Date of decision: 27.01.2025

Veena Rani

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Ekta Garg, Advocate
for respondents No.6 and 7.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

Petitioner Veena Rani has filed criminal writ petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking protection of life and liberty as well as her property from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7, out of which respondent No. 4 is the son, respondent No. 5 is daughter-in-law and respondents No. 6 and 7 are the one who had allegedly attacked house of petitioner. It is pointed out that respondent No. 4 is having criminal antecedents who has been disinherited by petitioner. He is threatening to grab her property. She had filed representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, Barnala dated 03.09.2024, which is Annexure P-8.

On 16.10.2024, the following order was passed:-

“ XX XX XX XX



Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State and prays for an adjournment to file status report.

Adjourned to 02.12.2024, for filing status report.

In the meantime, respondents No. 2 and 3 are directed to protect life and liberty of petitioner Veena Rani from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7, considering threat perception, as detailed in representation Annexure P-8.”

In compliance thereof, status report by way of affidavit of Gurbinder Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Tapa, District Barnala has been filed, which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is the duty of the State to protect the life and liberty of every citizen and maintain law and order.

Learned State counsel refers to the status report and submits that threat perception of the petitioner was dispassionately assessed. He submits that the apprehension raised by the petitioner was not found to be correct and even the prevention action i.e. proceedings under Sections 126/170 of BNSS, 2023, have been initiated against respondent No.4 and presented before the learned Court of Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Tapa, and the son of the petitioner is in judicial custody. Lastly, he submits that in case any incident constituting a cognizable offence is reported before the local police, then action, in accordance with law, shall be taken forthwith.



In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed.

Disposed of accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.01.2025

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No