

2025:PHHC:119447



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

114

CRWP-8643-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 03.09.2025

Jagga Singh**...Petitioner**

Versus

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

Present:- Mr. Rohan Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of direction to respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect the life, liberty and personal property of the petitioner from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7.

2. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. It is submitted therein and learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner was married to respondent No. 4 but due to some marital discord, the marriage was dissolved 23 years back. Respondent No. 5 is the daughter of the petitioner born out of his wedlock with respondent No. 4. It is further submitted that on receipt of a complaint dated 22.07.2025 from the petitioner, a thorough inquiry was conducted by the police and it was found that the bone of contention between the parties is 09 bighas of land, which the petitioner wants to take into his possession. Both the parties have been filing applications against each other. With regard to incident happened on 06.05.2025,

2025:PHHC:119447



preventive action under Sections 126/170 of BNSS, 2023 has been taken. More so, respondent No. 7-Shamsher Singh is not in India as he had gone to Canada. It is further submitted that previously, on the complaint of the petitioner that the private respondents did not allow Balwinder Singh or him to enter into his land, an FIR bearing No. 62 dated 11.11.2023 had been registered under Sections 427, 447, 506 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Thulliwal, District Barnala and the trial is going on. Hence, it is urged that no further action is required to be taken in the matter.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the factual assertions.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the record, it is apparent that thorough inquiry has been conducted by the police on the complaint of the petitioner. The aforesaid FIR has also been registered on his complaint. During inquiry, no threat perception has been found to the life, liberty and personal property of the petitioner. In view thereof, no further orders are called for in the matter and the petition is disposed of.

5. However, the petitioner is granted liberty to avail his alternative remedy in accordance with law with regard to his claim over the property in dispute.

03.09.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No