

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

221

**CRWP-6619-2025
Decided on: January 23, 2026**

Rookmina

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Nasir Jamal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Aazam Khan, Advocate,
for Mr. Hakmuddin, Advocate,
for respondent Nos. 7 to 10.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Petitioner – Rookmina wife of Salim, aged 32 years, has filed the instant *Habeas Corpus* petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue directions to official respondent Nos. 2 to 4 to trace out and produce the detainee, namely, Salim (husband of the petitioner), who supposedly has gone away to some unknown place with Sahreena, who is aged about 32 years and daughter of respondent No. 5 – Insaf.
2. On hearing the petitioner's counsel on 23.06.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“1. Petitioner – Rookmina, aged 32 years, has filed the instant Habeas Corpus petition to trace out the detainee namely ‘Saleem’, who is related as husband of the petitioner.

2. As per allegations, detainee has been taken away forcibly by the private respondents on 06.06.2024 at

around 11:30 A.M. from the house of the petitioner. It is also averred that while entering the house, private respondents were questioning the detenue to know the whereabouts of one 'Shareena' (daughter of respondent No.5 – Insaf).

It is in compliance to the direction dated 23.08.2024 passed by this Court in CRM-M-41103-2024, one FIR No.267, dated 2.9.2024 was registered u/s 346 IPC at P.S. Hathin. Neither any conclusive investigation is being conducted nor the detenue has been recovered till date.

3. *Notice of motion.*

4. *On asking of the Court, Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice for respondents No.1 to 4 – State and seeks time to get instructions and to file reply, if any.*

Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be handed over to the learned State counsel, during the course of the day.

5. *List again on 09.07.2025.*

To be shown in the urgent list.

6. *Let the status report be filed after verifying the facts.*

7. *Meanwhile, respondent No.3 is directed to examine the situation and, if any, place is indicated by the petitioner, or suspected by the police, due efforts be made to affect recovery of the alleged detenue – Salim.”*

Subsequently, when the matter came up for consideration, following was recorded by this Court in its order dated 09.07.2025:-

“i) *Whereabouts of the detenue are not known to the parties. However, during the course of the hearing, it was informed that the detenue, Salim, has eloped with Sahreena, daughter of respondent No. 5.*

ii) *Learned State counsel has filed a status report by way of affidavit of Kuldeep Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hathin, District Palwal, which has been taken on record. The Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place in the paper-book.*

iii) *Learned State counsel further submits that approximately 20 to 22 days after the disappearance of the detainee, a dead body was recovered and DNA profiling was conducted, which did not match the detainee's profile. Therefore, it is submitted that the petitioner's husband still needs to be traced by the official respondents.*

iv) *It is further submitted that a Special Investigation Team (SIT) has already been constituted, and the investigation is presently ongoing. Additionally, a reward of Rs. 5,000/- has been announced by the Inspector General of Police, South Range, Rewari, for information leading to the whereabouts of Salim and Sahreena.*

v) *Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for some time to assist the Court.*

vi) *List on 31.07.2025."*

3. Status report, dated 04.07.2025, has already been filed by the respondent State, wherein in para No. 5 it is explained that one dead body was recovered in the State of Karnataka, which was identified and recognized as that of Salim, by his mother Juhri and his brother. However, after conducting of DNA profiling of Mrs. Juhri and that of unknown dead body, the same did not match and it was concluded that the said dead body was not of detainee Salim. Further, in para No. 8 of the status report it has also been detailed that in regard to missing of Sahrina, daughter of respondent No. 5, already one case FIR No. 180, dated 09.06.2024, under Sections 363, 366 and 34 IPC, has been registered at Police Station Hathin, District Palwal, against Salim (detainee and husband of the petitioner) and others. And, in regard to the missing of Salim, another case FIR No. 267, dated 02.09.2024, under Section 346 IPC, has been registered at Police Station, Hathin, District Palwal.

In para Nos. 9 and 10 of the status report it has been mentioned that as per the investigation, detainee Salim and Sahrina both have eloped w.e.f. 06.06.2024 and for providing information a bounty of Rs.5,000/- has been announced by the office of Inspector General of Police, South Range, Rewari, vide order dated 04.03.2025.

4. I have considered the submissions made by respective counsel, alongwith the status report dated 04.07.2025.

Admittedly, age of the alleged detainee Salim and Sahrina, daughter of respondent No. 5, is between 32 to 35 years, and both have eloped w.e.f. 06.06.2024. Even in regard to the eloping of the daughter of respondent No. 5, one FIR has already been registered against the detainee Salim with the allegation of kidnapping Sahrina. Another FIR has been got registered by the petitioner, in regard to missing of detainee Salim. Reasonable steps, as detailed in the status report, have already been taken by the State agencies.

5. In view of above, no direction is required to be issued to trace out and produce the detainee before this Court.

Accordingly, the present petition stands **disposed of**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 23, 2026
Pkapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO