

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-2281-2024  
DECIDED ON: 15.03.2024

BABY  
.....PETITIONER  
  
VERSUS  
  
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS  
.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ved Parkash, Advocate  
for the petitioner.  
  
Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus for directing the respondents No.2 & 3 to produce Nikita Rana-detinue (daughter of the petitioner), who is illegal confinement of respondent No.5.
2. This Court vide order dated 11.03.2024 appointed a Warrant Officer and directed him to visit the alleged places of detention and any other place, as pointed out by the petitioner for getting release of alleged detinue from the illegal detention/confinement of respondent No.5.
3. In compliance thereof, a report of warrant officer namely Sandeep Mehta accompanied by a statement made by Nikita Rana d/o Satish Rana and Baby has been produced. According to the report, it is evident as has been recorded by the Warrant Officer that the alleged detinue namely Nikita Rana aged 22 years in her statement deposed that Ajay Rana wanted to make a friendship with her and also

wishes to marry with her, but she refused and on 06.03.2024, she left the home to her work place and thereafter on insistence of Ajay Rana, she accompanied to watch a movie and during that period, he again requests her to marry with him, but due to afraid of the same, she went to her aunt house at Shahadpur, wherein due to such fear her Aunt informed her maternal uncle and the maternal uncle visited the house, who took back to the alleged detainee to the petitioner's house and since then she is residing with her parents without any coercion or pressure. The said report is taken on record as Annexure 'A'. A copy of the same has been supplied to the counsel for the petitioner today in Court.

5. Having heard the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as on perusal of the report of Warrant Officer, this petition does not survive any further. Hence, the same is disposed off, having been rendered infructuous.

6. Ordered accordingly.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)  
JUDGE

15.03.2024

Meenu

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |