



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

120

CWP-4398-2026

Date of Decision: 27.03.2026

BHAGWAN SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate on behalf of
Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, D.A.G., Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents not to harass him and threaten to demolish his house.

2. The petitioner claims that he is resident of Village Kadar Nagar, Tehsil Dirba, District Sangrur. There are 40-45 constructed houses in the village. The respondent No.3-SHO Dirba is threatening him to demolish his house. They are alleging that he is involved in NDPS cases. There is only one case under Sections 15 and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 against him. He was granted anticipatory bail by this Court in the said case. The respondent No.4 who is Sarpanch of the Village is trying to show her performance in the movement tagged as "*Yudh Nasha Virudh*". The respondent has no power to demolish his house.

3. As per reply, Jagtar Singh and Budh Singh are involved in multiple cases registered under NDPS Act. They have purchased properties worth Rs.1.39 crore in the name of their relatives including petitioner's wife



namely Baljit Kaur. A land measuring 19 Kanal 13 Marla was purchased vide sale deed dated 28.02.2019 for a consideration of Rs.44.55 lakhs. Petitioner's wife is 1/3rd shareholder and she had paid a sum of Rs.12.60 lakhs. The respondent has initiated process of attachment of properties of the criminals. Properties of Jagtar Singh and Budh Singh have been attached. The petitioner's property is shown in the list of properties attached vide order dated 08.03.2021 passed by Competent Authority & Administrator, Smugglers And Foreign Exchange Manipulators (Forfeiture Of Property) Act, 1976 (for short 'SAFEMA') & NDPS Act, 1985.

4. Learned State counsel submits that apprehension of petitioner that his house may be demolished by authorities is misconceived. The authority constituted under SAFEMA/NDPS Act has attached his house and further proceedings would be initiated in accordance with law.

5. The petitioner is claiming that his house is likely to be demolished by respondents. The said fact is denied by respondents.

6. It is settled law that house of anyone cannot be demolished without following procedure prescribed by law. The respondent is claiming that petitioner's house has been attached by competent authority constituted under SAFEMA/NDPS Act. The Court is sanguine that authorities would not take law in their hand and do any illegal act.

7. In the backdrop, the petition stands disposed of.

8. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

27.03.2026
SDK

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