



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

CRWP-4490-2025

Date of decision: 04.07.2025

SUKHDEV SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Shekhar Kumar, Advocate
 for the petitioner.
 Mr. Jashan Jot Singh, Advocate for respondent No.6.
 Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner from the hands of respondent No.6, who, in connivance with respondents No.4 & 5, is harassing the petitioner

2. On 03.05.2025, the following order was passed :

“Present criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner from the hands of respondent No.6, who, in connivance with respondents No.4 & 5, is harassing the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the dispute between the petitioner and respondent No.6 pertains to an agreement to sell and respondent No.6, after accepting the earnest money, did not come present on the target date for execution of the sale deed. Further, it is purely a civil dispute and the petitioner has



CRWP-4490-2025

-2-

already filed the civil suit in this regard. It is further contended that respondents No.4 & 5 are summoning the petitioner on the basis of a complaint made by respondent No.6. The petitioner is 82 years of age and he is being harassed unnecessarily.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 5-State and seeks time to file the reply.

Adjourned to 04.07.2025.

Notice be also issued to respondent No.6 for the date fixed.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sukhchain Singh, at the very outset, submits that no substance in the allegations made by respondent No.6 was found. Further, the dispute between the parties is already pending before the competent Court of jurisdiction and the petitioner is not required for any purpose. As such, the present petition has become infructuous.

4. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel and the outcome of the inquiry, the present petition is disposed of.

July 04, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No