



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

CRWP-4884-2024

Date of Decision: 30.07.2024

Reena Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURBIR SINGH

Present: Mr. V.P. Singh Rathore, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Singh Bhatta, DAG, Punjab.

GURBIR SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer in the present criminal writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of direction to official respondents Nos.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner endangered at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 6, who have threatened to commit harm on her and her children.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a representation dated 21.05.2024 (Annexure P-4) was given to official respondent No.2, Commissioner of Police, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar but no action has been taken against respondent Nos.4 to 6.

3. Reply has not been filed. Learned State counsel seeks some more time to file the reply. He states that reply has been received but it is yet to be properly vetted.

4. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would be satisfied, if the representation made by her to respondent

No.2- Commissioner of Police, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar is directed to be decided expeditiously.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, respondent No.2-Commissioner of Police, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar is directed to decide the representation of petitioner expeditiously and not later than one month and till then to ensure safety of petitioner and her children and further to ensure that no harm is caused to her and her children.

6. Petition stands disposed of.

30.07.2024
Parveen kumar

(GURBIR SINGH)
JUDGE

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