



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

**146**

**CRWP-5277-2026 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 06.05.2026**

Prem Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate for  
Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging that his daughter Harsharanjeet Kaur has been illegally detained by respondent No.4-Arshdeep Singh son of Gurpreet Singh, resident of Lakhna, Tehsil Patti, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the daughter of the petitioner had called to inform him that she had been illegally detained by the private respondents i.e. respondents No.4 to 6 and anticipating imminent danger to his daughter, this petition has been filed.

3. The matter came up for hearing before this Court yesterday i.e. 05.05.2026 and counsel for the petitioner was confronted with the fact that there is no such specific averment in the petition and as such, the argument advanced was devoid of merit, considering that Harsharanjeet Kaur i.e. the daughter of the petitioner had earlier approached this Court vide CRWP-4662-2026 before this Court wherein she had suspected threat to her life and liberty from the hands of the petitioner herein, since she wanted to live with

the respondents. The said petition was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 23.04.2026 directing respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran to consider and decide the representation/complaint dated 16.04.2026 filed by Harsharanjeet Kaur (petitioner therein). Finding averments and arguments to be mischievous and abuse of process of law, counsel was asked to verify her instructions.

4. On resumed hearing, counsel for the petitioner reiterates the same submissions that the petitioner had received a call, however, the petitioner does not know the details of either the mobile/phone number or the date or time when such a call was received. The arguments thus advanced by the counsel for the petitioner, at the time of hearing not only fails to inspire confidence but also are not supported from the pleading. It thus seems that the petitioner is withholding relevant information as is essential to determine the veracity of the claim raised by him in the petition during the course of arguments. Hence apparently false plea has been raised in the battle of ego and failure to reconcile to the reality.

5. This Court is thus inclined to dismiss this petition imposing a cost of Rs.50,000/- on the petitioner for filing a frivolous and unnecessary petition to satisfy his ego under the false pretext of imminent threat and danger being anticipated to his daughter but refrains from doing so on the insistence of the counsel for the petitioner.

6. The present petition is accordingly ***dismissed***.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

**06.05.2026**

*Mangal Singh*

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