



115

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

**CRWP-3862-2025
DATE OF DECISION: 21.04.2025**

SHAHRUNA

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Mohd. Sabir, Advocate and
Mr. Harvinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. B.S.Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This Criminal Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus with a roving writ, the Warrant Officer may kindly be appointed to visit the spot or issuance of direction to respondents no. 1 to 3 to produce /release the detenue Sunnati (Aged 20 years) daughter of Shahrana (Petitioner) and be produced in court from the illegal custody of respondent No. 04 to 9.

On the last date, the Warrant officer was appointed who has submitted his report in Court today, which is taken on record and is reproduced below :-

‘In compliance with the order dated 17.04.2025 passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Moudgil undersigned was appointed as Warrant Officer in the above noted case on 18.04.2025.

At the very out set learned counsel for the petitioner informed telephonically that petitioner will meet me near police station Sector 40, Gurugram. I left Chandigarh at 12.15 pm on 18.04.2025 and reached police station Sector 40, Gurugram at 05.00 pm on 18.04.2025. Duty Officer PSI Bhim Singh met me in the police station. After disclosing my identity and purpose of visit, I asked him to provide police protection to search detainee Sunnati at the premises of Nadeem, owner of Nadeem Meat Shop r/o Indira Vikas Colony, Salokhra, Sector 30, Gurgaon. Petitioner told that detainee is residing there with respondent No.4 on rent.

Duty Officer told under signed that FIR No. 115 dated 13.04.2005 (Annexure R-1) has been registered under section 127(6) BNS at police station Sector 40, Gurgaon, on the complaint given by Khalid regarding missing of his wife Sunnati. He has also handed over statement of IO ASI Brij Mohan (Annexure R-2), in which he has stated that investigation is going on to search Sunnati.

I along with petitioner and police party reached the premises of respondent Nadeem. I along with petitioner searched each and every corner of his house but detainee was not found there. Nadeem told that detainee has left the rented room on 11.04.2025 alone. Thereafter, respondent No. 4 Khalid had vacated the room on 15.04.2025. He also show the room vacated by Khalid. Thereafter, petitioner asked under signed to conduct search at the residence of respondent No. 5. We reached police station

Ferozepur Jhirka at 08.25 pm. Duty Officer SI Dharmender met me in the police station. After disclosing my identity and purpose of visit, I asked him to provide police protection to search detainee Sunnati at the premises of respondent No. 5. I along with petitioner and police party reached the premises of respondent No. 5, who was present there. I along with petitioner searched each and every corner of his house but detainee was not found there.

Statement of petitioner (Annexure R-3) was recorded in which she has stated that she does not want to search at any other place as he does know any other place.

DD Entry made by the concerned police station at Annexure R-4 to 6.

I left for Chandigarh at 10:30 pm on 18.04.2025.

Report is submitted for kind perusal of His Lordship please.'

Learned State Counsel submits that the statements have been recorded and FIR was registered against unknown persons at the behest of respondent No.4, however, the alleged detainee has not been found even after the warrant officer visited the house of respondent No.5 along with the petitioner and police party. Further, the statement of the petitioner has been recorded which is annexed with the report as Annexure R-3, the same has been perused by this Court wherein the petitioner do not wish to get the search conducted at any other place.

At this stage, counsel for the petitioner submits that the alleged detainee has been recovered and he does not wish to press this petition any further.

In light of the statement of counsel for the petitioner, nothing survives in the present petition, hence, the same is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

21.04.2025
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>