


138

CRWP-13624-2025

-1-



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-13624-2025

Date of decision: 22.12.2025

SHANKY GARG AND ANR.

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate and
Mr. Harmeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.


.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and its workers from respondents No.7 to 10. It is stated in the petition that the petitioner has already made representation dated 26.11.2025 (Annexure P-4) before the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Bathinda raising the said grievances, but no action has been taken so far.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied if appropriate directions are issued to respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, District Bathinda to consider the aforesaid representation filed by the petitioner and take necessary action thereon.

3. Notice of motion.



4. Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG Punjab, who is present in Court, has accepted the notice on behalf of the respondents-State and submits that the needful will be done in due course.

5. In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of at this stage with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider and decide the aforesaid representation dated 26.11.2025 (Annexure P-4) of the petitioner qua threat perception only within a period of 30 days from today, by passing a speaking order in accordance with law.

22.12.2025
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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