



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

108

CRWP-9566-2025
Date of decision: 03.09.2025

BACHITTAR SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Yagsimant Attri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition is for seeking directions to respondents No.2 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and to take appropriate action against the private respondents.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner as well as the private respondents are neighbours. The private respondents had borrowed a sum of Rs. 2.75 lakhs from the petitioner and had given a cheque in return for the said amount. On presentation, the said cheque was dishonoured as a result whereof, the petitioner has availed of the remedy under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. Ever since, the petitioner has been receiving threatening calls from the private respondents. He relies upon the

**CRWP-9566-2025**

-2-

screenshot of the calls that he has received from one Inderjit Singh, purportedly a Reader to the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, Punjab. He submits that he has submitted repeated representations to the police authorities, however, no action has been taken.

3. Counsel contends that he has an audio recording of the discussion that he had with the Reader to the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, Punjab, however, no such audio recording or its transcription has been appended alongwith the present petition.

4. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and have gone through the documents available on record.

5. I do not find that sufficient grounds are made out for issuance of any directions to the official respondents to extend any protection to the petitioner. A mere detail of certain call having been received by the petitioner itself cannot be assumed to conclude that the call was threatening in nature. The petitioner is required to refer to some *prima facie* material so as to demonstrate that the apprehension raised by the petitioner is real and not imaginary.

Finding no merit, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**SEPTEMBER 03, 2025****JUDGE***Vishal Sharma*

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No