

2026.PHHC.008468



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

258

CRWP-8817-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.01.2026

Jasdeep Singh and others**...Petitioners**

Versus

State of Punjab and others**...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. D. S. Gandhi, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Baldev S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No. 5.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the official respondents No. 2 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and their family members from the hands of respondents No. 4 to 6 and to take action on their representation dated 09.07.2025 (Annexure P-3).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are permanent residents of the village Muradwala Dal Singh. Petitioner No.1 is an elected member of the Gram Panchayat, who has been diligently performing his duties and actively participating in developmental works of the village. It is submitted that due to political rivalry and personal enmity, private respondent No.5, whose wife is also an elected Panch of the same village, has been consistently opposing the lawful functioning of the Panchayat and the

2026.PHHC.008468



developmental initiatives supported by petitioner No.1. On account of this rivalry, the private respondents have been issuing repeated threats to the petitioners, including explicit threats to their life and liberty, with a clear intention to intimidate them and to falsely implicate them in frivolous criminal cases.

3. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioner No.1 has repeatedly approached the police authorities and senior officials by submitting detailed representations narrating the acts of intimidation, threats and harassment at the hands of the private respondents. However, despite such representations, no effective action has been taken by the police authorities. On the contrary, respondent No.4, allegedly acting in connivance with and under the influence of the private respondents, has been adopting coercive measures to harass and pressurize the petitioners. In support of the plea of mala fides and abuse of authority, learned counsel submits that an adverse order was earlier passed by the District Development and Panchayat Officer (DDPO) against petitioner No.1, which was subsequently quashed by the Special Secretary, Rural Development and Panchayat Department, thereby vindicating the stand of the petitioners and demonstrating the motivated nature of the actions taken against them.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that specific incidents, including threatening WhatsApp calls, intimidation of villagers supporting petitioner No.1, and the recent incident of assault on the Panchayat Secretary and tearing of official Panchayat records during a duly convened meeting of the Gram Panchayat, clearly establish the lawless conduct of the private respondents and the grave and imminent threat faced by

2026.PHHC.008468



the petitioners. It is, therefore, urged that appropriate directions be issued to the official respondents to consider and decide their representation expeditiously and take action against the private respondents strictly in accordance with law and ensure adequate protection to the petitioners and their family members.

5. Reply has been filed by the respondent-State. A separate reply has also been filed on behalf of respondent No. 5. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for respondent No. 5, has submitted that pursuant to the representations made by the petitioners, a thorough and impartial inquiry was conducted by the police authorities. During the inquiry, it was revealed that wife of respondent No.5, namely Bhupinder Kaur, as well as petitioners No.1 and 6, are elected members of the Gram Panchayat of village Muradwala Dal Singh and that there exists an internal dispute amongst the Panchayat members regarding certain developmental works of the village. It is submitted that out of the total Panchayat members, five are on one side and three, including petitioners No.1 and 6, are on the other side and the dispute appears to be political and administrative in nature. It is further submitted that there is also a dispute regarding alleged illegal occupation of the village pond site and that respondent No.5 has moved complaints before the concerned department against petitioners No.1 and 6 regarding uprooting of trees belonging to the village, which are presently under inquiry. After conducting a detailed probe, no material was found to substantiate the allegations of threats or intimidation as alleged by the petitioners nor was any threat perception found against them. Consequently, the representations of the petitioners were duly considered and filed.

2026.PHHC.008468



6. Learned State counsel has further submitted that as a preventive measure and in order to maintain peace, a Calandra under Sections 126/170 of the BNSS was presented by the police on 25.09.2025 against private respondent No.5 before the learned Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Fazilka. It is thus submitted that the police has acted promptly and within the four corners of law and that no illegality, arbitrariness or impropriety can be attributed to the official respondents. Hence, the dismissal of the petition is prayed for.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

8. On a perusal of the material placed on record, it emerges that the grievance raised by the petitioners arises largely from an internal dispute amongst the members of the Gram Panchayat with regard to developmental works and other local issues including the alleged occupation of village land. The inquiry conducted by the police pursuant to the representations submitted by the petitioners does not reveal any material to substantiate the allegation of imminent threat to the life or liberty of the petitioners. Rather, the dispute appears to be political and administrative in nature, arising out of factionaling within the Panchayat. It is also evident that the police authorities have not remained inactive. A detailed inquiry was conducted, the representation of the petitioners was duly considered and disposed of and as a preventive measure, proceedings under Sections 126/170 of the BNSS were initiated against private respondent No.5 before the learned Sub-Divisional Magistrate. In these circumstances, it cannot be said that the official respondents have failed in discharge of their statutory duties or acted in a manner warranting interference by this Court. In view thereof, no case is made out for issuance of

2026.PHHC.008468



any direction to the official respondents. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

22.01.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No