



CRWP-12270-2025 (O&M) -1-

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

128

**CRWP-12270-2025 (O&M)
Decided on: 23.12.2025**

RAHUL LAHOT

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Vivek Baghla, Advocate (Through VC)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)**CRM-W-1851-2025**

Allowed as prayed for and Annexures P-4 to P-6, are taken
on record, subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

1. The prayer in the instant criminal writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of directions to official respondents to investigate into the complaint/representation submitted by the petitioner and to protect life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondent Nos.5 to 13.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members is in danger from respondents and apprehends that they may cause harm to them by getting them involved in false and frivolous cases at the behest of respondent No.6 who is inimical and is out to do anything to get the possession of

the plot in dispute. He submitted that representation (Annexure P-5) in



CRWP-12270-2025 (O&M) -2-

this regard, has been moved by the petitioner to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, but it went in vain. Learned counsel also submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied if directions be issued to concerned respondent to look into the aforesaid representation(s) and to take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and submitted that the petitioner is residing at Chandigarh and was called upon to join the inquiry and get his statement recorded but he did not turn up for the same, however, the concerned authorities will take action on the representation, in accordance with law.

5. On this, learned counsel for the petitioner contended that he resides in Fazilka only and was never called upon for such inquiry by the authorities concerned.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the State, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.4- Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, District Fazilka to look into the matter and take action in accordance with law

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

23.12.2025

Sonia Puri

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