



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

123

CRWP-7508-2026

Date of Decision: 25.06.2026

BALVINDER SINGH**..... Petitioner**

Vs

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**.....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI**

Present: Mr. Amit Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

RAMESH KUMARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the official respondent No.2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 10 and to take action on their representation dated 12.05.2026 (Annexure P-4).

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has recently filed a representation on 12.05.2026 before the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Kaithal (Annexure P-4) 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 petitioner would be satisfied if appropriate directions are issued to respondent



No. 2- Senior Superintendent of Police, District Kaithal to decide the aforesaid representation filed by the petitioner and take necessary action thereon.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana, 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 paperbook be supplied to him during the course of the day.
5. In view of the limited prayer made by the petitioner, 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 12.05.2026 (Annexure P-4) of the petitioners within a period of three weeks from today, by passing a speaking order in accordance with law. Needless to say, if any threat is found to the petitioner, the official respondents would provide them adequate security in order to protect their life and liberty.
6. It is made clear that this order shall not be taken to protect the petitioner from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by him.

25.06.2026
pooja saini

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/Reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>