



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

124

CRWP-10939-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 16.10.2025

Muskan and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Khalid Tauru, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present case, on 09.10.2025, following order was passed
by this Court:-

“i) Present criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing respondents No. 1 to 3 for protection of life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 10.

ii) As per the memo of parties, addresses of both the petitioners and private respondents No. 4 to 10 are stated to be of District Alwar. However, photographs of the solemnization of marriage have not been appended to the present petition.

iii) Let the photographs of the solemnization of marriage of the petitioners be placed on record. It is clarified that the petitioners shall furnish the photographs in the Registry within a week from today without filing a separate application. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place in the paper book.

iv) List on 16.10.2025.

v) Meanwhile, learned State counsel is directed to



verify the actual place of residence of the petitioners, and ascertain whether both are residents of the States of Haryana, Punjab, or the Union Territory of Chandigarh.”

2. Today, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 15.10.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

3. As per aforesaid status report, during the course of recording statements of the persons concerned by the police, one of the person named, Alam, in his statement dated 09.10.2025 (Annexure R-1) stated that petitioner No.2 – Sajid, is his brother-in-law (Sala) and both the petitioners, have never resided in his house, except of one day visit and now, they are not residing with him.

Statements dated 12.10.2025 (Annexures R-2 & R-3, respectively) of both the petitioners were also recorded by the police, wherein, both of them have specifically stated that they are residents of Rajasthan at the address(s) as given in the present petition. They have also specifically stated that both of them are residing together for the past two months, and not apprehending any danger to their lives, thus, requires no security.

4. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioners prays for withdrawal of the present petition.

5. Having perused the status report and the statements annexed therewith, this Court finds no ground to entertain the present petition. The



same is liable to be dismissed on two counts, i.e., firstly, for want of jurisdiction with this Court, and secondly, as the petitioners themselves have categorically stated in their respective statements that no threat perception exists to their lives and liberty.

6. The petition stands dismissed accordingly.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

October 16, 2025
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*