



CRWP-12092-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

112

CRWP-12092-2024
Decided on: 07.04.2025

Avatar Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. S.P. Soi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manjot Singh, Advocate for
Mr. G.S. Randhawa, Advocate
for respondent No.4

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of directions in the nature of mandamus, to official respondents to provide protection of life and liberty of the petitioners and their other family members at the hands of private respondent.

2. On 05.04.2025, following order was passed:

“Present: Ms. Kanchan, Advocate for
Mr. S.P. Soi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

i) Present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of directions in the nature of mandamus, to official respondents to provide protection of life and liberty of the petitioners and their other family members at the hands of private respondent.

ii) Respondent No.4-Ramanjit Kaur is daughter in law of petitioners No. 1 and 2, who is widow also. It is upon the application moved by respondent No.4 claiming some right in the property that the petitioners apprehended some foul smell and



filed instant petition for seeking protection of their life and liberty.

iii) In response to the notice of motion issued by this Court, learned State counsel filed status report dated 31.03.2025, by way of affidavit of Sanjeev Kumar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division City Batala, Police District Batala on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 in the Court today. Same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.

Learned State counsel refers to paragraph No.4 of the status report and submits that the dispute is within the family members and that too of civil nature i.e. claiming rights in the property. Thus, there being no criminality involved, no action is warranted at the instance of official respondents.

iv) As the arguing counsel for the petitioner is stated to be not available and an adjournment is requested on his behalf, list on 07.04.2025.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

3. Faced with situation, Mr. S.P. Soi, Advocate submits that he does not want to press the present petition at this stage and prays for liberty to raise all necessary plea at appropriate stage, before appropriate forum, as available to the petitioners in accordance with law.

4. Dismissed as not pressed with liberty sought and recorded hereabove.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 07, 2025

rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**