



CRWP-1028-2026

-1-

113

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1028-2026
Date of decision :06.04.2026

SATYAVIR SINGH BADGUJAR AND OTHER

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Satyavir Singh Badgujar, Advocate
Petitioner No.1-in-person.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (ORAL)

The present petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India is for the issuance of a writ of mandamus seeking police protection and for the issuance of certain other directions as enumerated.

2. The petitioner No.1-in-person contends that he is representing certain clients in civil proceedings before the Courts at Rohtak. Certain advocates representing the opposite party along with the President and Secretary of the Bar have committed multiple offences against the petitioner. An FIR No.228 dated 10.10.2025 (Annexure P-8) U/s 3(1)(r), 3(2)(va) of SC and ST, Act and Sections 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, P.S. Arya

**CRWP-1028-2026****-2-**

Nagar, Rohtak has been registered at the instance of the petitioner No.1-in-person who has been beaten up by the accused named therein. Despite the said fact, the Investigating Agency is not providing security to the petitioner No.1 and his family members. The investigation in the said case has not been conducted in a fair manner leading to the preparation of a cancellation report. On 12.03.2026 another occurrence took place in which the persons named an FIR No.228 dated 10.10.2025 and their supporters have once again beaten up the petitioner No.1. The medico-legal examination of the petitioner No.1 has also taken place. He, therefore prays that adequate protection be provided to him, FIR No.228 dated 10.10.2025 (Annexure P-8) U/s 3(1)(r), 3(2)(va) of SC and ST, Act and Sections 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, P.S. Arya Nagar, Rohtak be reopened, a fresh FIR be registered against the accused for the occurrence of 12.03.2026 and further investigation be ordered in all cases registered by him where cancellation reports have been submitted/accepted.

3. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that the petitioner No.1 is a chronic litigant. He has either got registered FIRs against various persons or filed complaints against them. Most of the said FIRs/complaints have been found to be baseless and cancellation reports have been filed. He was initially provided security which has been withdrawn on 27.12.2022 on a threat perception assessment being carried out. FIR No.228 dated 10.10.2025 (Annexure P-8) U/s 3(1)(r), 3(2)(va) of SC and ST, Act and Sections 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, P.S. Arya Nagar, Rohtak got registered at the instance of petitioner No.1 has been found to be false and a

**CRWP-1028-2026****-3-**

cancellation report shall be submitted within a period of four weeks. As regards the occurrence of 12.03.2026, he contends the CCTV footage of the Bar Association area at the Court Complex, Rohtak would show that no such occurrence has taken place. He, therefore prays that the present petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5. A perusal of the record would reveal that the petitioner No.1 is a chronic and habitual litigant. He has initiated multiple complaints/FIRs against a number of persons including school teachers, advocates etc. without any credible evidence to support his allegations. Numerous FIRs registered on the basis of these complaints have undergone thorough investigation by the police and the investigations have revealed that the allegations made by petitioner No.1 lack merit and his conduct would amount to a clear misuse and abuse of the legal process by him as he appears to be using provisions of the law including those of the SC and ST Act as instruments to harass, intimidate and create unnecessary litigation against innocent parties. It has been found that the allegations levelled in FIR No.228 dated 10.10.2025 (Annexure P-8) U/s 3(1)(r), 3(2)(va) of SC and ST, Act and Sections 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, P.S. Arya Nagar, Rohtak are completely baseless. A cancellation report is to be presented within a period of four weeks. As regards the occurrence of 12.03.2026, it has been found without any doubt whatsoever that no such occurrence took place in which the petitioner No.1 suffered injuries. Though, petitioner No.1 got himself medico-legally



CRWP-1028-2026

-4-

examined, the injuries which are simple in nature seem to have been manipulated as the CCTV footage would reveal absolutely no occurrence having taken place.

6. The petitioner No.1 has got registered multiple cases, the details of which are as under:-

Sr. No.	FIR Nos. and date	Sections	Police Station	Status
1.	FIR No.233 dated 15.04.2022	3(2)(v), 3(1)(i) of SC/ST Act, 75 JJ Act and 506 of IPC	P.S. Shivaji Colony, Rohtak	Cancellation submitted/accepted on 10.11.2022
2.	FIR No.35 dated 16.01.2023	506, 427, 341, 323, 120B IPC	P.S. Shivaji Colony, Rohtak	Cancellation submitted/accepted on 11.05.2024
3.	FIR No.43 dated 24.02.2024	323, 506 IPC, 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act	P.S. Arya Nagar, Rohtak	Pending
4.	FIR No.228 dated 10.10.2025	3(1)(i), 3(2)(va), 341, 34, 506 IPC of SC and ST Act	P.S. Arya Nagar, Rohtak	Cancellation submitted/accepted on 11.12.2024
5.	FIR No.286 dated 31.10.2025	506 IPC, 3(2) (va), 3(1)(i), 3(1)(s) of SC and	P.S. Arya Nagar, Rohtak	Cancelled



		ST Act		
6.	FIR No.444 dated 28.07.2015	U/s 3 SC and ST Act and 34, 506, 452, 323 IPC	Rohtak City	consideration/ appearance

7. The cases registered against the petitioner No.1 are as under:-

Sr. No.	FIR Nos. and date	Sections	Police Station	Status
1.	FIR No.234 dated 15.04.2022	354A, 354D IPC	P.S. Shivaji Colony, Rohtak	Pending consideration under for charges
2.	FIR No.235 dated 15.04.2022	186, 332, 353, 354A IPC	P.S.Shivaji Colony, Rohtak	

8. As regards the cases registered by or against the petitioner No.1 the parties concerned are at liberty to avail their remedies in accordance with law.

9. As regards protection to be provided, it is apparent that the Investigating Agency has carried out multiple threat perception assessments and it has been found that the petitioners or their family members do not require any police protection.



CRWP-1028-2026

-6-

10. In view of the above contentions of the rival parties, I find no merit in the present petition. Therefore, the same stands dismissed.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

06.04.2026
JITESH

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No