



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

112

**CRWP-5450-2026
Date of decision: 11.05.2026**

SIKANDER SINGHPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRespondents

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

Present: - Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed for seeking directions to respondents No.2 to 6 to ensure protection of life and liberty of petitioner and his family members at the hands of respondents No. 7 to 12.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner's wife is handicapped and the petitioner has two minor children. He also has four sisters, who are well settled and married at different places. The petitioner is taking care of his mother and the entire land. However, at the instigation of the elder daughter namely Rajinder Kaur and others, the petitioner's mother took away the gold ornaments and gave the same to her daughters a few months ago. Later, petitioner's mother and her other daughters, came to the house of the petitioner, in his absence, with

some unknown persons and started quarrelling with his handicapped wife and minor children. They also forcibly entered the house and tried to dispossess the petitioner and his family from the house and also tried to put a lock over the same. Alleging that the same was an act of house trespass, the petitioner submitted a request to the authorities averring that the landed property was a joint holding and there had been no partition of the land, hence, it would be improper to vacate the land at this stage without getting it partitioned from the revenue authorities. The Civil Suit bearing No. 79 of 2024 titled as "*Sikander Singh versus Mukhtiar Kaur and others*" for permanent injunction was later filed by the petitioner before the Civil Court, Bathinda and the same is sub judice. He contends that notwithstanding lack of any action against the respondent(s) viz. mother of the petitioner, the authorities directed the petitioner to pay maintenance at the rate of Rs. 4000/- per month to his mother, against which he has already preferred a petition before Punjab & Haryana High Court which is also pending. He contends that false complaints have been filed and proceedings under Section 107/151 Cr. P.C. have also been initiated against the petitioner. He accordingly submitted a representation to the authorities to protect his life and liberty but no action has been taken thereupon.

3. It is evident from a perusal of the pleadings as well as the documents appended alongwith the present petition that the complaint had been submitted by the petitioner against his mother and other siblings without producing any document on record on the basis whereof his title over the land as well as the house in question could be established. There is also no document on record on the basis whereof his exclusive possession can be deemed to have been established. The petitioner does not dispute that

the private respondents are undisputedly co-sharers in the property, hence, the allegation of trespass would not be made out against the respondent(s). The present petition is thus grossly misconceived and is only an attempt to pressurize the agencies to act against the private respondents notwithstanding as to whether any criminal case is made out against them or not. Consequently, the **present petition is dismissed** being an abuse of the process of law by imposing a cost of **Rs. 5,000/-** on the petitioner to be deposited with *Punjab and Haryana High Court Court Bar Clerks Welfare Fund*”.

MAY 11, 2026*Vishal Sharma***(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No