



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1115-2025
DECIDED ON: 03.02.2025

SALMA BIBI AND ANRPETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORSRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Abdul Aziz, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioners seeking direction to the official respondents, to protect their life and liberty from the hands of private respondents.
2. Obviously, it appears that it is a matrimonial dispute between petitioner No.2 and respondent No.4.
3. Respondent No.4 namely Nasreena Bibi had firstly moved a complaint dated 04.11.2024, regarding which Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Ahmedgarh, had submitted a report dated 17.12.2024, to Senior Superintendent of Police, Malerkotla, concluding therein that “*the allegations levelled by the applicant (respondent No.4) against her Jeth Mohd. Salim, Jethani Soma, and Razia are found to be baseless. As it is a domestic dispute between Nasrina Bibi and her husband Shamshad Ali, no action is required to be taken by the police.*”

Both the parties were directed to approach Hon'ble Court for their grievance. There is no danger to peace. As such, keeping pending the application without any reason is not appropriate"

4. It is thereafter, that the petitioners have moved a complaint dated 13.01.2025 to Senior Superintendent of Police, Jagraon, expressing their apprehension because respondent No.4 and his other associates had entered the house of the petitioners, threatened to kill them and had stolen the gold ornaments and cash amount of Rs.2,20,500/- from the house of the petitioners.

5. This Court is unable to take direct cognizance at its first instance, and therefore, does not find any substantial reason under the law, to entertain such petitions.

6. Accordingly, present petition stands **dismissed**.

7. However, it would be open for the petitioners and husband of respondent No.4 to take recourse to the legal remedy available to them, under the law.

8. It is clarified that present order would not be construed as an observation on any of the fact alleged by other side in their complaints.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

03.02.2025

Lavisha

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*