

2025:PHHC:085379



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

106

**CRWP No.7270 of 2025
Date of decision: 15.07.2025**

Kuldeep Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J.(ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for directing the respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and personal liberty of the petitioner at the hands of private respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner along with his brother Ranjeet Singh entered into an agreement to sell dated 21.06.2014 with respondents No.4 to 8 to purchase a land measuring 26 Kanals 14 Marlas, situated at Village Rasoolpur Kalan, Tehsil and District Amritsar for a sale consideration of Rs.32,75,000/- per acre. Out of the total sale consideration, the petitioner paid an earnest amount of Rs.25,00,000/- to the respondents No.4 to 8 on the execution of the aforesaid Agreement to Sell. Thereafter, as the date of execution of the Sale

deed was approaching, the petitioner had opted to enquire/confirm about the same from the private respondents, whereby instead of answering to it, they preferred to avoid the petitioner on one pretext or the other. Then, the petitioner requested the private respondents to refund the earnest money paid by him but instead of feeling apologetic or refunding the amount in question, they had enunciated vituperative words to him. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a civil suit for specific performance of agreement to sell in question. The private respondents while retaliating to aforementioned proceedings had got extended threats to the petitioner with the help of anti social elements to settle the dispute with them by relinquishing his claim and right over the land agreed to be sold by the respondents and further withdrawing the cases filed by the petitioner against them. The said incident was duly reported by the petitioner to the police but no action was taken against them. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that the petitioner had also filed representation dated 04.04.2024 (Annexure P-1) before the Commission of Police, Amritsar, but till date no action has been taken.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that he would be satisfied, in case, the pending representation dated 04.04.2024 (Annexure P-1) is decided by respondent No.2.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice and submitted that she has no objection if the aforesaid representation dated 04.04.2024 (Annexure P-1) is decided.

In view of the above, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2—the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, to look into the

representation dated 04.04.2025 (Annexure P-1), at the earliest, regarding threat perception and take necessary steps, if any required, in accordance with law, to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioner is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents. However, it will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

15.07.2025
jjyoti3

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

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