



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

121

CRM-M-2056-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.01.2025

MANJU DEVI

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking issuance of an appropriate order or direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to take action against respondents no.4 & 5 for using illegal force against the petitioner and for illegally trying to dispossess the petitioner and restraining the respondents from illegally dismantling the underground Irrigation Pipeline of the petitioner and take action on their representation dated 28.12.2024 (Annexure P-3).

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has recently filed a representation on 28.12.2024 before the Superintendent of Police, Rohtak (Annexure P-3) raising their grievances as mentioned in the present petition but the same has not yet been considered and no action has been taken thereon. He further submitted that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied if appropriate



directions are issued to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Rohtak to decide the aforesaid representation filed by the petitioner and take necessary action thereon.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Apoorv Garg, Sr. DAG, Haryana who is present in Court, has accepted the notice on behalf of the respondents-State and submits that the needful will be done in due course. Let a complete set of the paperbook be supplied to him during the course of the day.

5. In view of the limited prayer made by the petitioner, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of at this stage with a direction to respondent No. 2 to decide the aforesaid representation dated 28.12.2024 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioner within a period a period of one month, by passing a speaking order in accordance with law. Needless to say, if any threat is found to the petitioner, the official respondents would provide them adequate security in order to protect his life and liberty.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

16.01.2025

Deepak Patwal

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No