



123

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

CRWP-3657-2025

Date of decision:- 09.04.2025

GIAN CHAND AND ANOTHER**....Petitioners****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS****... Respondents****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.**

Present:- Mr. Mohan Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for direction to the official respondents to provide protection to life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondent Nos. 4 to 6.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners are apprehending threats to their lives at the hands of the respondents No. 4 to 6, and they have also moved a representation dated 19.03.2025 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2 but no action has been taken till date. He contends that the instant petition is maintainable in the light of the judgment of Division Bench of this Court passed on 09.09.2024 in ***CRWP-4660-2021 titled as Yash Pal and another vs. State of Haryana and others***. He submits that petitioners will be satisfied, if, appropriate directions



are given to respondent No.2 Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad to consider and dispose of the representation dated 19.03.2025 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law, in an expeditious manner, after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

3. Notice of Motion to official respondents only.

4. On the asking of the Court Mr. Arun Kumar Gujjar, AAG, Haryana who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of State respondents 1 to 3.

5. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.2 Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad to consider and dispose of the representation dated 19.03.2025 (Annexure P-5) keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and if so warranted, take action, to ensure protection to the life and liberty of the petitioners, strictly in accordance with law.

6. 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).

7. Petition stands disposed of in above terms.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

09.04.2025

Gyan

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