



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

CRWP-3742-2025

Date of decision: 11.04.2025

Tamanna Khatun alias Tamanna Kumari and another
....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others **....Respondents.**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Ms. Aarti Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

.....
SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Articles 226/227 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 had moved the representation dated 09.04.2025 (Annexure P-5) to the Superintendent of Police, District Yamuna Nagar, Jagadhari (inadvertently mentioned as Senior Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, Jagadhari) 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 09.04.2025 (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. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana, 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- Superintendent of Police, District Yamuna Nagar, Jagadhari, to consider and dispose of the representation dated 09.04.2025 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law in an expeditious manner.
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 against them, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).
8. Disposed of.

11.04.2025

puneet

- i) Whether speaking/reasoned?
- ii) Whether reportable?

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No