



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

**CRM-M-29562-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision : 24.04.2026**

Ravneet Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

U.T., Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE

Present: Ms. Ravneet Kaur, Petitioner-in-person.

Mr. Rajiv Vij, Addl. P.P., for U.T., Chandigarh.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner, who appears in person, submits that she is not ready with arguments.

2. This Single Bench has been specially constituted to hear the petitioner's cases, as several sitting judges of this Court have recused from hearing cases filed by the petitioner for reasons attributable to the petitioner.

3. This Court is taking all pains to hear the matters of the petitioner and decide the same on merits and therefore, same reciprocal assistance is expected of the petitioner, which unfortunately is not coming forth.

4. In view of the above, this Court proceeds to decide this matter finally.



5. The prayers in this petition can be summarized as follows:
- (i). For grant of police protection to the petitioner.
 - (ii) To comply with the provisions of Section 160 Cr.P.C. by granting 10 days' prior notice to the petitioner in case any offence is registered against her.
 - (iii) Further prayer is made for protection of the petitioner, who claims herself to be a rape victim and for treating the present petition as dying declaration in case the petitioner is no more. The petitioner has also prayed for 15 days' notice u/s 41 Cr.P.C. in case of registration of any offence against her.
6. As regards the first prayer of the petitioner regarding police protection, the petitioner has pointed out that she has made several complaints claiming police protection, as contained in Annexure P-3.
- 6.1. Learned counsel for the respondents, however, contends that none of these complaints, filed in writing by the petitioner before various authorities, contain any request seeking police protection.
- 6.2. The petitioner, is though, unable to point out any of the complaints contained in Annexure P-3, which makes a request for providing police protection, however, this Court grants another opportunity to the petitioner to make a written request to the Senior Superintendent of Police of the concerned district, within which the cause for apprehension, in the mind of the petitioner to seek police protection, has arisen, and if such a complaint is filed within a period of 15 days, then the same shall be considered and decided by the competent authority i.e.



jurisdictional Senior Superintendent of Police by passing a speaking order within one week of its filing and communicating the same to the petitioner within a further period of 7 days thereafter.

7. As regards the second prayer, which pertains to 10 days' prior notice before issuance of summons u/s 160 Cr.P.C. to any witness, is concerned, this Court has perused Section 160 Cr.P.C., which for ready reference and convenience, is reproduced below:-

“160. Police officer's power to require attendance of witnesses.

(1) Any police officer making an investigation under this Chapter may, by order in writing require the attendance before himself of any person being within the limits of his own or any adjoining station who, from the information given or otherwise, appears to be acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case; and such person shall attend as so required:

Provided that no male person [under the age of fifteen years or above the age of sixty-five years or a woman or a mentally or physically disabled person] *[Substituted for the words "under the age of fifteen years or woman" by Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2013]* shall be required to attend at any place other than the place in which such male person or woman resides.

(2) The State Government may, by rules made in this behalf, provide for the payment by the police officer of the reasonable expenses of every person, attending under sub-section (1) at any place other than his residence.”



8. This Court is unable to find any such statutory requirement of giving 10 days' prior notice to any witness for his/her attendance, who is acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the alleged offence. As such, the second prayer of the petitioner **stands rejected**.

9. The petitioner, who appears in person, has relied upon the decision of the Apex Court in the case of **Mahendra Prasad Agarwal vs. Arvind Kumar Singh and others**, 2026 SCC OnLine SC 302.

9.1. In the considered opinion of this Court, the said decision of the Apex Court deals with the aspect of contempt jurisdiction and does not relate to the fact situation of the present case. The Apex Court, while finding fault with the order passed by the jurisdictional High Court in framing charges under the contempt jurisdiction, issued certain directions for exercising the contempt jurisdiction in a proper, fair and judicious manner. This case revolves on a different set of facts, which are not relatable to the factual scenario in the present case and therefore, is of no avail to the petitioner.

10. I have heard the prayer of the petitioner for treating the present petition as a dying declaration, which is a little difficult not only to understand, but also comprehend and therefore, I say no more.

11. No other prayer is made in the present petition, which seeks invocation of inherent powers of this Court, which can be exercised only to give effect to the Court orders, to prevent



abuse of the process of the Court or to secure the ends of public justice.

12. This Court does not find that any such eventuality has arisen enabling this Court to invoke inherent jurisdiction in the present case and therefore, the present petition stands disposed of.

13. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

**(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

April 24, 2026
Ajay Prasher

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No