



110

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

CRWP-3430-2025

Date of decision: 08.04.2025

Yusuf

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. K.S. Billing, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for respondents No.4 to 51.**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

The present criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* by directing official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondents No.4 to 51 who are issuing threats for elimination of life to him and his family members.

The learned State Counsel, at the very outset, on the instructions of Inspector Aman Beniwal, submits that the crop which is ripe for harvesting, will be harvested with the assistance of the police. A Duty Magistrate was appointed on 04.04.2025 to oversee the cutting of the crop. She further submits that the petitioner is not the owner of the land in question and that after the harvest, the agricultural produce will be entrusted to the rightful owners of the land. Further, the description and area of the land is not mentioned and the petitioner has approached this Court by filing a vague and misleading petition. Moreover, in fact, the nephew of the petitioner, namely, Ismyle, is involved in

**CRWP-3430-2025****-2-**

the murder of Mehboob, therefore, the petitioner is filing such frivolous petitions.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the owner of the land are the relatives of the petitioner and he mentioned the name of one, Aasin in the representation itself.

Be that as it may, in view of the fact that 40 acres of wheat crop is ripe for harvesting, the petitioner or any other person having the rightful claim, would submit the necessary documents regarding the description and ownership of 40 acres of land to the jurisdictional police authorities within a period of three days and thereafter, the owner of the land would be allowed to harvest the wheat crop in the presence of the Duty Magistrate and police party.

The learned State counsel has very fairly submitted that the entire process would be videographed.

In view of the specific stand taken by the learned State counsel, the present petition is disposed of accordingly and no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

08.04.2025*Neha*

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