


2024:PHHC:108451



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

110

CRWP-7070-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.08.2024

Nirmal Singh**...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab and others**...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. J. K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of direction to respondent No. 2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members from the hands of respondent Nos. 3 and 4 and to decide the representation dated 13.06.2024 (Annexure P-9) submitted by the petitioner.

2. The respondent-State has filed the action taken report by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Phul, District Bathinda. Learned State counsel, in terms of the said report, has submitted that there is a dispute between the parties regarding some land and the parties had filed cases against each other in civil Court and revenue authorities. The petitioner was called by the police authority on 08.07.2024

2024:PHHC:108451



with regard to inquiry on his application and he got recorded his statement that he did not want to pursue the matter. Hence, the application/representation of the petitioner was consigned to record room. The allegations of the petitioner that he police had taken his signatures on blank papers on 08.07.2024 are totally false. It is further submitted that in pursuance of order dated 31.07.2024, passed by this Court, the police had gone to the village of the petitioner on 19.08.2024 but the petitioner had refused to get his statement recorded in support of his representation. However, the statements of the respectable persons were recorded, wherein they had stated that there was a land dispute between the parties and on 19.08.2024, the police officials had come to record the statement of the petitioner but he had refused to do so.

3. The factual position, as stated in the reply, is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. In view of the submissions made in the report and also in view of the fact that there is a land dispute between the parties, which is stated to be subjudice before the civil Court, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case has been made out to issue any direction to the official respondents. Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

22.08.2024

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No