

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

235

2025:PHHC:153081



CRWP-9451-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 06.11.2025.

JASPAL SINGH

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

PRESENT Mr. B.R. Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed for seeking directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner alleging the same to be in danger at the hands of respondents No.4 and 5 and to take further action on the complaint dated 15.08.2025 as well representation dated 23.08.2025.

Petitioner approached this Court alleging that he is owner in

possession of land measuring 1 kanal 10 marlas situated at village Adwadh Ladhai, Tehsil Jagraon, purchased vide sale deed dated 23.07.1990. Mutation of the said property was duly entered in the name of the petitioner and three shops had been constructed thereupon, which were in possession of the petitioner where he is selling plastic articles.

It is contended that after a lapse of nearly 35 years, in the first week of August, 2025, the private respondents declared that the shops had been purchased by their elders in the year 1991 and asked the petitioner to vacate the said shops. It is contended that as a result of the threat, the petitioner approached the Civil Court, Jagraon and filed a civil suit seeking declaration and injunction. It is contended that on the intervening night of 14th and 15th August 2025, private respondents along with 5-6 unknown persons came to the property of the petitioner and committed the theft of articles of the petitioner worth Rs.2 lakhs and also took away cash of Rs.8500/- by breaking open the locks. They also threatened to kill the petitioner as well as members of his family in case he did not vacate the shops. It is contended that respondent No.4 is a retired Havildar from Punjab Police and is misusing his official position, hence, the present petition.

Pursuant to notice issued by this Court, status report on behalf of official respondents No.1 to 3 by way of an affidavit of Jasjyot Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Jagraon, District Ludhiana (Rural) has been filed in the Court today. A copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel for the petitioner. The relevant extract of the same reads thus:-

“3. That in compliance to the above noted order of this Hon'ble court, it is respectfully submitted that the petitioner had moved an Application dated 15.08.2025 (Annexure P-6) with the SHO,

P.S.City, Jagraon levelling allegations that respondents No.4 and 5 broke opened the locks of his shops, stole material worth Rs.2.00 Lacs and took forcible possession of the shops. Inquiry on the said application of the petitioner was conducted by ASI Gurdeep Singh of P.S.City, Jagraon during which both the parties were joined in the inquiry and their statements were recorded. Ultimately it was revealed that the wife of respondent No.4 namely Beant Kaur was owner of four shops out of which two shops were rented out to the present petitioner where the petitioner used to sell plastic utensils. However, presently the petitioner was not running the said shops and had closed those shops and there was no proof that respondents No.4 and 5 broke opened the locks of the petitioner's shops and/or took forcible possession. However, both the parties are claiming their right on the shops and they have filed Civil Suits against each other. Thus it was revealed that no police action is warranted in the matter and there is absolutely no danger to the life and liberty of the petitioner from the private respondents.

The above noted Inquiry Report of ASI Gurdeep Singh was further examined and verified as well by the SHO-P.S.City, Jagraon. Copy of the said Inquiry Report dated 27.08.2025 is annexed hereto as Annexure R-1/T.”

It is evident from a perusal of the above that the allegations levelled by the petitioner have already been inquired into and the petitioner has failed to produce any evidence regarding breaking open of the locks and removal of his articles worth Rs.2 lakhs and cash of Rs.8500/-. Both the parties are claiming their rights over the shops and civil suits have been filed by the parties against each other before the competent Court.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and going through the status report filed by the respondent-State, I am of the opinion that no further directions are required to be issued in the present case since the

petitioner failed to substantiate his allegations during inquiry and parties have already approached the civil Court.

The present petition is consequently dismissed at this stage.

The parties are, however, at liberty to pursue their alternative remedies as per law before the appropriate forums, if so advised.

November 06, 2025.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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