



255

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

**CRWP-6086-2025
DECIDED ON:21.07.2025**

DALJIT KAUR AND OTHERS

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajiv Verma, Senior DAG Punjab

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been invoked, for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondent No. 2, to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 & 5, who are in connivance with respondent No.3 are threatening and harassing the petitioners with further direction, not to harass and pressurize the petitioners to accede the illegal demands of respondents No.4 and 5.

A short reply dated 18.7.2025 filed by way of an affidavit of Rajesh Hastir, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Economic Offence and Cyber Crime, SAS Nagar, Mohali by learned State counsel, is taken on record. Copy there of, has been supplied to the counsel opposite.

The relevant extract/para of the afore-said reply reads as under:-

“7. That nevertheless, it is submitted that from the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it transpired that the matter was related with alleged breach of aforesaid agreement to sell subsisting amongst the parties, for which civil proceedings were underway between them before the Ld. Court of competent jurisdiction. As such, finding that the matter pertains to civil dispute, the Incharge, Economic Wing, SAS Nagar- respondent no.3 vide his report dated 04.07.2025 had made recommendation for filing of aforesaid complaint. The recommendation made was verified by the DSP (Hq.), SAS Nagar and thereafter, the report of DSP (Hq.), SAS Nagar dated 04.07.2025 was approved by the office of SSP, SAS Nagar. True translated copy of report dated 04.07.2025 is annexed herewith as Annexure R-1/T for the kind consideration of this Hon'ble Court.”

In view of afore-said reply, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition has been rendered infructuous and be disposed off, as such.

Hence, the present petition has been disposed off, as having been rendered infructuous.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

21.07.2025

Sham

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>