

CRWP-12869-2025
Date of decision: 08.12.2025

...PETITIONERS

...RESPONDENTS

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that there is a threat to life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos.5 and 6 and in this regard, the petitioner has moved a representation but no action has been taken so far. Petitioner No.1 is repeatedly being extended threats that she and her son Sanamdeep Singh, once he comes back from abroad, would be eliminated if she does not withdraw the complaint.



3. Upon advance notice, learned State counsel appeared and on instructions from ASI Sukhdev Singh, submitted that representation moved by the petitioner has been looked into. Pursuant to the inquiry conducted by senior rank officer, it has been concluded that there is no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners and it is a dispute between husband and wife. Further, if the petitioners are not satisfied and aggrieved by finding of enquiry, they can exhaust their legal remedy as available to them in accordance with law.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that no case for issuance of any direction to respondent is made out. However, if the petitioners are not satisfied with the finding of competent authority on their representation, they are at liberty to avail legal remedy as per ratio of law held by Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Sakiri Vasu Vs. State of U.P. and others, (2008) 2 SCC 409*.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

December 08, 2025
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No