



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

112

CRWP-4907-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.04.2026

Rajpreet Singh and another

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Yogesh Saini, Advocate for
Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to ensure protection of life and liberty of the petitioners as well as their family members from the hand of respondents No.5 and 6. A further prayer has been made for directing respondent No.3 to consider and decide the representation dated 20.04.2026 of petitioner No.1 by passing a speaking and well-reasoned order within a stipulated time.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that respondent No.5 had filed a suit for specific performance of agreement to sell dated 15.03.2017 whereby the petitioners had allegedly agreed to sell the house in question for a sum of Rs.24 lakhs and received a sum of Rs.5 lakhs as earnest money. He contends that as alleged in the suit, the date of execution of sale deed was fixed as 12.09.2017 on payment of balance sale consideration. Due to a holiday on 12.09.2017, respondent No.5 allegedly contacted the petitioners on 13.09.2017 for execution of sale deed but they

did not come present on the said date. It is submitted that as alleged by respondent No.5, he got his attendance marked in the office of Sub-Registrar, Patiala by moving an application to show his willingness and readiness for execution of the sale deed in his favour.

3. It has been further averred that the petitioners as well as respondent No.5 had engaged one counsel-Amarjit Singh Nirman to conduct the proceedings on their behalf but the said counsel did not convey any date of proceedings to the petitioners as well as proforma respondents No.4 and 5 in the civil suit. A further submission has been made that an *ex-parte* order dated 29.10.2018 was thereafter passed in the civil suit on an application moved by respondent(s).

4. Apparently, a perusal of the entire petition shows that the grievance espoused by the petitioners pertains to the proceedings that are pending before the Civil Court as well as in the execution that has arisen therefrom. There is not an iota of evidence on the basis whereof it may be assumed that there is any illegality committed by the respondent(s) or that they had threatened the petitioners. Since the execution proceedings are already pending before the Executing Court, institution of the present petition, by contemplating illegal action is clearly mischievous to create multiplicity of litigation and to delay execution proceedings that are pending before the Executing Court.

5. Consequently, the present petition is ***dismissed***.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

29.04.2026

Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No