


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

108



CRWP-7532-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.05.2026

Jaswinder Singh Sandhu

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. H. P. S. Rahi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance directions to official respondents No. 2 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members at the hands of respondents No. 5 to 7.
2. Upon notice, reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State. In terms of the same, learned State counsel has submitted that there is an ongoing dispute between Narinder Singh Sandhu (son of the petitioner) and respondent No. 5 Gurjinder Singh regarding access path leading to the latter's land. Both parties have filed complaints against each other and are also pursuing civil litigation before the learned Civil Court at Phillaur seeking injunctions with respect to the said pathway, which matters are presently pending adjudication. With regard to the alleged incident dated 29.06.2025, no conclusive material surfaced during inquiry to substantiate the allegations levelled by Narinder

Singh. He also failed to produce any cogent evidence regarding the alleged assault. The MLRs obtained from Civil Hospital, Phillaur and Civil Hospital, Jalandhar were found insufficient to establish commission of any cognizable offence against the private respondents. It is further submitted that the allegations regarding trespass upon the land of Narinder Singh also could not be substantiated during inquiry, as Gurjinder Singh claimed a right of passage through the disputed pathway, which had earlier been acknowledged by Narinder Singh during compromise proceedings before the Phillaur police. Moreso, the villagers of Kang Araian supported the claim that Gurjinder Singh had been using the said pathway to access his land and that the path had originally been provided by Davinder Kaur after exchange of land with Narinder Singh. Even the allegations regarding unlawful entry by Paramvir Singh and Simarpreet Singh on 29.06.2025 could not be proved during investigation. Hence, in the inquiry so conducted, it was concluded that the dispute is purely of civil in nature. Even no threat was found either to the petitioner or his family members. Hence, it is urged that the petition deserves to be dismissed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the factual assertions.

4. In view of the same, without commenting anything on the claims of the parties, which are subject matter of the civil litigation pending before the Court concerned, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground to issue any direction to the official respondents has been made out. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

18.05.2026

Waseem Ansari

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No