



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

116

CRWP-6288-2026
Date of decision: 27.05.2026

SURJIT SINGH AND ANOTHERPetitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRespondents

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

Present: - Mr. Anmol Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed for seeking protection of life and liberty of the petitioners on the allegation that they have been attacked by respondents No.8 and 9 and their accomplices as a result whereof which the petitioner has sustained injuries, consequent whereupon DDR/Rapat No. 10 dated 02.10.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1) & (2), 109, 351 (2) & (3), 191 (3), 190 of BNS, 2023 but still the police has not taken any action against the respondents, who are moving scot-free and threatening the petitioner with dire consequences.

2. The grievances espoused is principally regarding non-filing of final report in the aforesaid rapat, I am of the opinion that the said grievance can be duly redressed by the petitioners by moving an appropriate application before the Illaqa Magistrate and would not require issuance of

directions to the respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners. Further, reliance is placed by the petitioner on certain photographs to bolster the allegation that certain trees have been illegally removed from the Panchayat land. A perusal of the said photographs even reflects through cutting of certain trees, however, the said photographs, by themselves would not be sufficient to establish guilt of the respondents.

3. It is evident that a complaint in this regard has been already submitted by the petitioners to the Police officials as well as to the Human Rights Commission. A General Diary entry was recorded in the matter and an enquiry has also been initiated. However, the said enquiry has not yet concluded so as to record any finding to the effect that the trees have been illegally removed by the respondents. Besides, the question as to whether the Human Rights Commission could have gone into the aspect of alleged illegal felling of the trees is concerned, the same would be a matter of separate consideration.

4. There is no fact-finding enquiry that would *prima facie* establish the allegations. In view of the aforesaid, I am of the opinion that the allegations raised in the present petition appear to be only a self-serving claim of the petitioners particularly in the absence of any fact finding inquiry to *prima facie* establish the same.

5. In the given circumstances, the present petition is **disposed of** at this stage with liberty to the petitioner to pursue his alternative remedies if so advised.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

MAY 27, 2026
Vishal Sharma

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