



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

230

CRM-M-28677-2026

Date of Decision: 27.05.2026

CHARANJIT SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate for respondents No.4, 5 and 7.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. On 20.05.2026, following order was passed:-

'i) Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS seeking issuance of directions to official respondents No. 1 to 3 to take appropriate legal action against respondents No. 4 to 12. A further direction is also sought against respondents No. 2 and 3 to take action on the complaints/representations dated nil (P-5), 22.11.2025 (P-6), 17.02.2026 (P-7), and 16.04.2025 (P-8).

ii) Although the relief sought in the present petition pertains to a dispute between landlord and tenant, which can ordinarily be resolved by the Civil Court, it would nevertheless remain open to the petitioner to file an appropriate application/complaint before the Court of the learned Area Magistrate in case any criminal act has been committed.



However, after hearing the petitioner, considering the facts and circumstances involved, and in an attempt to explore the possibility of an amicable resolution, notice is issued only to the tenants, i.e. respondents No. 4 to 12, for 27.05.2026.

iii) Process dasti only.

iv) Respondents No. 4 to 12, or any of their representatives duly authorized and responsible for the matter, shall remain present before the Court on the date fixed.

v) To be taken up at 02:00 p.m. '

2. Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.4, 5 and 7 and submits that the operation of the order, whereby the petitioner had been directed to take possession, was stayed. In view thereof, it was the petitioner himself who had filed the execution application and having no locus to continue with the same, subsequently withdrew the execution application. In furtherance thereto, the petition filed by the petitioner before this Court challenging the *ex parte* order was also disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

3. In view of the above, no case for issuing specific directions regarding handing over/taking over of possession is made out.

4. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 27, 2026

Nisha-1

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No