



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

**CRWP-4851-2024
Date of decision: 24.05.2024**

Jamuna and another

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Dhanvinder Singh Nigha, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

.....

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 6.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners, feeling aggrieved by the act and conduct of private respondents No. 4 to 6 and apprehending threats to their life and liberty had moved the representation dated 20.05.2024 (Annexure P-5) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, District SAS Nagar (Mohali), but till date no action thereon has been taken. He further submits that for the



purpose of the petition, the petitioners will be satisfied if appropriate directions are given to respondent No.2 to consider and dispose of the aforesaid representation dated 20.05.2024 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law in an expeditious manner.

3. Notice of motion to official respondents.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondents No. 1 to 3 and submits that the aforesaid representation will be disposed of in an expeditious manner in accordance with law.

5. After considering the rival contentions and considering the limited request made by learned counsel for the petitioners and without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, District SAS Nagar, (Mohali), to consider and dispose of the dated 20.05.2024 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law in an expeditious manner and if needed, provide requisite protection to their life and liberty.

6. The decision so taken be intimated to the petitioners.

7. It is made clear that this order is not to be construed as any opinion with regard to the age of the petitioners or factum or validity of their relationship in any civil or criminal proceedings nor the petitioners would be entitled for any protection against their arrest or



continuance of any criminal proceedings, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

8. Disposed of.

24.05.2024
preeti

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

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