



CRWP-12628-2024

1

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

(117)

CRWP-12628-2024  
Date of Decision:- 31.12.2024

Rooma and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Shiv Kumar Rana, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhotra, APP, U.T. Chandigarh.

\*\*\*\*

**ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of directions to official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has failed to demonstrate any threat perception and learned State counsel has also pointed that the petitioners are not living at the address mentioned in the petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners reiterates that petitioners are residing at the same address, however, could not demonstrate any cogent threat perception, more so, petitioner No. 1 is a married woman and respondent No. 4 is the husband and respondents No. 5 to 7 are the mother-



CRWP-12628-2024

2

in-law and sister-in-law of petitioner No. 1. The petitioner No. 1 also has two children who are living with their father (respondent No. 4) and on one hand, it is submitted that the petitioner No. 1 is living in live-in relationship for the last two years with petitioner No. 2 and on the other hand, submits that the divorce petition was filed in the year 2024 in Family Court at Haridwar which also stands dismissed on account of non presence of petitioner No. 1.

4. Petitioner No. 1 apparently seems to be playing hide and seek and abusing the process of law by filing such frivolous petition and in the present petition it is submitted that petitioner No. 2 is earning Rs. 25,000/- by doing a private job. It is not coming out as to how the petitioner No. 1 is sustaining herself for the last two years living separately from her husband and what is the sudden threat perception which has erupted for filing the present petition. The present petition seems to be absolutely vague and misuse of the law and therefore, deserves dismissal with exemplary cost.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners prays that he be permitted to withdraw the present petition.

6. Considering the above, the present petition stands dismissed as withdrawn with a direction to the respondent Authorities to check the antecedents of petitioner No. 1 thoroughly and in case, she is found involved in any such activity, appropriate action be taken against her in accordance with law.

(ALOK JAIN)  
JUDGE

31.12.2024  
Parul

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