

2026.PHHC.065221



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

162

CRWP-4954-2026

Date of decision: 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2026

Khushi and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Union Territory Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Anand Kumar Maurya, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP, U.T., Chandigarh.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-**

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the official respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 and 5 and take action on their representation dated 27.04.2026 (Annexure P-4).

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have recently filed a representation on 27.04.2026 before the Senior Superintendent of Police, U.T. Chandigarh raising their grievances as mentioned in the present petition but the same has not yet been considered and no action has been taken thereon. He further submitted that at this stage, the petitioners would be satisfied if appropriate

2026.PHHC.065221



directions are issued to respondent No. 2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh to decide the aforesaid representation filed by the petitioners and take necessary action thereon.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T., Chandigarh, 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. Let a complete set of the paper-book be supplied to him during the course of the day.
5. In view of the limited prayer made by the petitioners, 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 decide the aforesaid representation dated 27.04.2026 (Annexure P-4) of the petitioners within a period of 15 days from today, by passing a speaking order in accordance with law. Needless to say, if any threat is found to the petitioners, the official respondents would provide them adequate security in order to protect their life and liberty.

[MANISHA BATRA]  
JUDGE

28<sup>th</sup> April, 2026  
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned

:

Yes / No
2. Whether reportable

:

Yes / No