



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

131

CRWP-7637-2026**Date of Decision:-26.06.2026****ARTI AND ANOTHER****....Petitioner(s)****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS****...Respondent(s)****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI**

Present: Mr. Rhythem Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioners.

* * * *

RAMESH KUMARI. J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners and also directing the private respondents not to interfere in the personal lives and liberty of the petitioners and to take action on their representation dated 24.06.2026 (Annexure P-5).

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have recently filed a representation on 24.06.2026 before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, District Fazilka (Annexure P-5) 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 directions are issued to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, District Fazilka to decide the aforesaid representation filed by the



petitioners and take necessary action thereon.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Adeshwar Singh Pannu, AAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, has accepted the notice on behalf of the respondent-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 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 24.06.2026 (Annexure P-5) 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.

6. It is made clear that this order shall not be taken to protect the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them.

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

26.06.2026

P.Bhatt

i)	<i>Whether speaking/reasoned?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
ii)	<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>