



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

234

CRWP-11492-2025

Date of Decision : November 20, 2025

MANISH GROVER

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

UT OF CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present : Mr. Satyam Tandon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP for UT, Chandigarh.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

1. The prayer in the present petition under Articles 226 of 227 of the Constitution of India is for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No.1 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members.

2. On 03.11.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Short reply dated 03.11.2025 by way of an affidavit of Anurag Daru, ASP-South/West Division Chandigarh has been filed on behalf of respondent-State by the learned State counsel and the same is taken on record.

The learned counsel for the State-UT, Chandigarh, submits that an FIR No.0219 dated 29.10.2025 under Sections 308(2) and 351(2) of BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 384 and 506 IPC) stands registered against unknown persons. He seeks some time to file an additional reply.

Adjourned to 20.11.2025.

In the meantime, two PSOs be provided to the petitioner and his family members forthwith.

Meanwhile, the DSP Chandigarh shall conduct the investigation into the FIR which stands registered.”

3. Thereafter on 12.11.2025, the following order was passed:-

“CRM-W-1645-2025

This is an application for preponing the date of hearing in the main case.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the main case is ordered to be preponed from 20.11.2025 to today and the same is taken up on Board today itself.

CRM-W-1648-2025

Allowed, as prayed for. Annexures P-4 to P-6 are taken on record.

CRM-W-1646-2025 and CRM-W-1647-2025

Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner wishes to withdraw the present applications.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Main case

Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner confined his prayer to the extent of providing security to the petitioner and his family members outside UT, Chandigarh.

Though the learned State counsel states that the PSOs provided to the petitioner and his family members are not allowed to provide protection outside the limits of UT, Chandigarh, as per the policy of UT, Chandigarh, however, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the instant case, two PSOs shall provide security to the petitioner and his family members in the States of Punjab, Haryana and any other State where they would be travelling.

Adjourned to 20.11.2025.”

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner states that in view of the aforementioned orders, the petitioner and his family members have been granted adequate security.
5. The learned State counsel submits that in terms of the aforementioned orders, two PSOs have been provided to the petitioner and his family members, who shall accompany the petitioner and his family members even outside the States of Punjab, Haryana or any other State and regular threat perception assessment would be carried out.
6. In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition at this stage.
7. Disposed of.

November 20, 2025

ajaysharma

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No

Whether Reportable. : Yes/No