



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

166

CRWP-5237-2024

Date of Decision:- 31.05.2024

MANPREET KAUR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate for the petitioner.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directions to respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of private respondent Nos. 4 to 8.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner, feeling aggrieved by the act and conduct of private respondents No.4 to 8 and apprehending threats to her life and liberty had moved the representation dated 28.05.2024 (Annexure P-2) to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda, but till date no action thereon has been taken. He further submits that for the purpose of the petition, the petitioner will be satisfied if appropriate directions are given to respondent No.2 to consider and dispose of the aforesaid representation dated 28.05.2024 (Annexure P-2) 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-respondent Nos. 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 petitioner 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, Bathinda, to consider and dispose of the representation dated 28.05.2024 (Annexure P-2) in accordance with law in an expeditious manner so as to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and if needed, provide requisite protection to her life and liberty.

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

7. It is made clear that this order is not to be construed as any opinion with regard to the age of the petitioner or factum or validity of her relationship in any civil or criminal proceedings nor the petitioner would be entitled for any protection against her arrest or continuance of any criminal proceedings against her, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

8. Disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

31.05.2024
S.Sharma(syr)

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