



CRWP-5815-2020

1

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

115

**CRWP-5815-2020
Decided on:19.05.2026**

Balram Ji Dass**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH****Present: Mr. Jagjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.************SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

1. Present criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and personal liberty of the petitioner and his family members, and to take action on the application dated 08.05.2026 (Annexure P-2) submitted to respondent No.2.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner is the plaintiff in a civil litigation and that a suit for permanent injunction is pending before the Court of learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Samrala. It is further submitted that, in the said civil suit, vide order dated 10.09.2025 passed in an application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC, defendant No.1, namely Pardeep Singh, has been restrained from interfering in the possession of the plaintiff-petitioner over the suit property, i.e. the shops in question.

3. Considering the civil dispute between petitioner and one Pardeep Singh regarding the shops, which is already pending adjudication



before the competent Civil Court at Samrala, the grievance raised in the instant petition prima facie appears to have been projected only to exert pressure upon the defendant in the civil suit by seeking intervention of the police authorities, on the basis of the representation dated 18.05.2026.

4. It is not uncommon that, in cases where any violation of a stay order is alleged or interference is caused despite the injunction granted by the Civil Court, appropriate remedies are available under the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure for enforcement of such orders.

5 Insofar as the alleged apprehension to the life and liberty of the petitioner is concerned, despite opportunity having been granted by this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any specific incident supported by any cogent material so as to substantiate the said apprehension.

6. In view of the aforesaid discussion, present petition is hereby dismissed, being devoid of merit.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 19, 2026
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO