

2025:PHHC:089460



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

246

CRWP-11777-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.07.2025

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

Present:- Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate
for respondents No. 7 to 9.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioners under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of directions to respondent No. 2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and their family members from the hands of respondents No. 7 to 10, who are harassing them to get possession of the land/property of the petitioners.

2. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for respondents No. 7 to 9, has submitted that on the representation received from the petitioners, thorough inquiry has been conducted in the matter, wherein it has surfaced that father of respondents No. 2 and 3 had appointed respondent No. 10 as General Power of Attorney in respect of property No. 27/7,8 falling in village Hamidpura with a condition that he may sale, lease, rent or get the mutation sanctioned

2025:PHHC:089460



relating to the said property. Respondent No. 10, being attorney holder, had executed three sale deeds in favour of one Kiran Handa, respondents No. 8 and 9 and possession of the property was handed over to them and the mutation was also sanctioned in their favour. During the course of inquiry, it has also been found that there is no area in the name of petitioner No. 1. Rather, all the area of property No. 22/7, 8 is registered in the name of Kiran Handa, Poonam Handa and Vinod Handa and they are having possession over the said land and no truth was found in the representation/application submitted by petitioner No. 1. Learned State counsel has further submitted that even no threat perception was found to the lives and liberty of the petitioners or their family members and in case, there is any such perception in future, appropriate action will be taken in accordance with law.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners could not dispute the aforesaid facts.

4. In view of the above and considering the fact that the matter is of civil nature, no ground is made out to issue any direction to respondent No. 2. Hence, the petition is dismissed. However, if the petitioners feel any threat to their lives and liberty in future, they will be at liberty to approach the SHO of the local police station, who will act in accordance with law to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners.

18.07.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No