



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

117

CRM-M-57036-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 13.10.2025

Fazruddin

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Afzal Hussain, Advocate, for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for seeking directions to official respondents to protect their life and liberty at the hands of private respondents and also to decide representations dated 07.07.2025 and 24.09.2025 filed by the petitioner in a time bound manner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner's daughter Sarmeen was married to Rahul, son of Rustam of Village Ghusinga, District Deeg, Rajasthan, as per Muslim rites and that she was subjected to harassment and dowry demands. He contends that the matter was however then settled amongst the parties, hence, he had not brought his daughter back home. He contends that his elder daughter Parveen was married to Rasid (elder brother of Rahul) and that she had consumed poison which resulted in her death. It is submitted that Sarmeen was given beatings on 02.07.2025 for which she was medically examined at the Government Hospital, Punhana. He contends that the respondents are now threatening the petitioner. He has thus approached this Court seeking protection.

3. On a specific query being asked, counsel for the petitioner



117 CRM-M-57036-2025(O&M)

contends that Nikkah was seemingly performed in and around 2015, hence a period of 10 years has elapsed since the performance of the marriage. Further, so far as the nature of injuries and the medico legal examination is concerned, the same has been examined. The nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner's daughter-Sarmeen are abrasions.

4. Seemingly the incident in question that took place within the jurisdiction of State of Rajasthan, however, notwithstanding the same the medico legal examination has been undertaken at Government Hospital, Punhana.

5. Even though learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has received a threatening call and has been under constant distress, however, the alleged threat is not substantiated.

6. In view of the above, there is no prima facie case for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3 at this stage. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an application before the concerned SHO alongwith requisite substantive evidence. In the event of any such application being filed alongwith supporting evidence, the SHO-respondent No.3 is directed to proceed with the same as per law.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with liberty as aforesaid.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

13.10.2025

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Sumit Gusain

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No