



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

249

**CRWP-3745-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 28.04.2025**

SHUBHDEEP KAUR AND ANOTHER

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Satnam Sishodia, Advocate for
Mr. R.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajinder Singh Bhatta, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondent Nos.4 to 15.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners, feeling aggrieved by the act and conduct of private respondents Nos.4 to 15 and apprehending threats to their life and liberty had moved the representation dated 10.04.2025 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, 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 10.04.2025



(Annexure P-5) in accordance with law in an expeditious manner.

3. Learned State counsel submits that the aforesaid representation will be disposed of in an expeditious manner in accordance with law.

4. 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-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to consider and dispose off the representation dated 10.04.2025 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law in an expeditious manner so as to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and if needed, provide requisite protection to their life and liberty.

5. The decision so taken be intimated to the petitioners.

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 against them, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

7. Disposed off.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

28.04.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

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