



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

201

CRWP-12181-2024

Decided On: 29.04.2025

NAVPREET SINGH

....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Raj Kanwar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sartaj Singh Gill, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

The petition has been filed seeking a direction to respondents no.1 and 2 to protect the petitioner's life and liberty which is statedly in danger at the hands of respondents no.3 to 6.

2. Learned State counsel contends that all the complaints made by the petitioner have been examined and no threat to his life and liberty could be noticed. In this regard, he has made a reference to the following paragraphs of the status report:

4. That during the aforesaid preliminary inquiry it came to light that:

i. Dr. Jagtar Singh, in his recorded statement, stated that while Respondent No.4 demanded repayment of money from the Petitioner at his clinic on 23.07.2024, there was no instance of Respondent No.4 placing a revolver on the Petitioner as alleged.

ii. The then SHO of Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, in his recorded statement, stated that no quarrel or altercation occurred between the parties (Petitioner and the Respondent No.4) inside the police station on the alleged date of 04.08.2024

iii. The licensed weapons, namely a revolver (.32 bore) and a pump-action firearm belonging to Respondent No.4, had been



deposited at Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, on 16.08.2024, following the suspension of his arms license vide letter No. LPA-9089 dated 08.08.2024 issued by the Ld. Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Gurdaspur. This fact was corroborated by Receipt No.96, confirming that the weapons were in police custody and therefore the same could not have been used by the Respondent No.4 as alleged on 12.11.2024.

iv. The Facebook account of Respondent No.4 did not contain any video showcasing illegal weapons as alleged by the Petitioner. To further verify the claim, a letter (No. 81-5A dated 21.01.2025) was sent to Facebook seeking information about the alleged video upload from the Facebook id of the Respondent No.4. It is pertinent to mention that the response to this communication is awaited.

v. That the inquiry revealed a presence of a monetary dispute between the Petitioner and Respondent No.4. Copies of the documents such as a cheque issued by the Petitioner, a cheque bounce memo, and a legal notice from Respondent No.4's counsel, were submitted by the Respondent No.4 during the preliminary inquiry. Moreover, a complaint case under NI Act is also pending case before the Ld. JMIC, Batala, instituted by the Respondent No.4 's firm against the petitioner.

vi. Call Detail Records (CDRs) of Respondents No.4 to 6 were procured, which revealed that on 12.11.2024 and 13.11.2024, during the bye-elections of the Dera Baba Nanak Assembly Constituency, the mobile locations of the said Respondents indicated that they were not in the area of Dera Baba Nanak. This finding directly contradicts the Petitioner's allegation that the Respondents No. 4 to 6 were present in Dera Baba Nanak during the said period.

5. That based on the above findings, the DSP, Batala (City) had recommended filing the aforementioned complaints, as the allegations made by the Petitioner were not substantiated by any evidence. However, it was noted that the response from Facebook regarding the alleged video is awaited. Should any



incriminating evidence emerge from the said response, appropriate legal action will be initiated. It is pertinent to mention that the aforesaid recommendations and the report have been approved by the deponent, and the complaints have been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to dispute the facts aforementioned.

4. Apparently, threat apprehended by the petitioner at the hands of respondents no.3 to 6 was on account of monetary transactions, and the apprehension has been found without substance.

5. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition and it stands disposed of. In case the petitioner faces any threat to his life and liberty at a later stage, he will be at liberty to make a representation before the respondents upon which appropriate action will be taken in accordance with law.

29.04.2025
Ad

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No