

2026:PHHC:044839



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

**CRM-W-275-2026 in/and
CRWP-11629-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.03.2026**

Ravneet Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

Sartej Singh Narula and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE

Present: Ms. Ravneet Kaur, Petitioner-in-person,
(Through V.C.)

Mr. Rajiv Vij, Addl. P.P., for U.T., Chandigarh.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. With the concurrence of parties, the main petition i.e. CRWP-11629-2025 is preponed and taken up today itself.
2. The petitioner has preferred this petition under Article 226 read with Article 227 of the Constitution of India, praying for the following relief:-

To issue appropriate directions to the competent authority to put criminal law in motion and initiate appropriate legal action against Sartej Singh Narula and Gagandeep Jammu to protect the life & liberty, dignity of the petitioner (Officer of the Court).

To kindly allow the present Criminal Writ Petition Under Article 226/227 to safeguard the fundamental rights of the petitioner guaranteed under Article 14 and 21 of Constitution of India by issuing appropriate directions in the interest of natural justice to the competent authority to provide Police

Protection to the petitioner on the cost of State along with litigation cost (as per provisions of SC/St (POA) Act 1989) to travel to Delhi and Gurugram for filing petitions before Supreme Court of India against false and malicious prosecution instituted against the petitioner by fellow Advocates, police officials including Sartej Singh Narula and Gagandeep Jammu, Advocates. As well as to protect the fundamental right of right to practice law to manage the livelihood. As this harassment, exploitation and humiliation of the woman Lawyer amounts to abetment of suicide, infringement of fundamental right, right to live with dignity.

And

To put quietus on this matter as the matters of the petitioner are already sub-judice before this High Court, hence, no Bar Association or any Advocate or authority reserves the right to compel the petitioner to withdraw any allegation against any accused. Hence, DGP, Chandigarh may be directed to take appropriate action against Sartej Singh Narula and Gagandeep Jammu, Advocates, to stop the harassment and exploitation of the petitioner along with directions to security incharge through DGP, Chandigarh, to not act upon false and frivolous orders issued and signed by Sartej Singh Narula and Gagandeep Jammu against petitioner without applying their legal minds and verification of the facts. Because vide dated 15.09.2025 and 16.09.2025 police constable has harassed the lady Advocate/Petitioner while performing her legal duties being Officer of the Court obstructed the petitioner and created nuisance and ruckus stating that Gagandeep Jammu has circulated some notice that petitioner cannot enter at High Court premises. Surprising fact is that none of the police officials applied their legal mind before illegal restrain of the petitioner while performing legal duties and followed the false order blindly. One male officer even touched the petitioner from the back, shoulder and arm and pulled the petitioner to get the petitioner out from the enter gate at gate no.4 and gate no.1 of the Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, which attracts Section 354 IPC(74 BNS) (outrage the modesty of the woman), which has made the petitioner and other women feel unsafe at workplace which is Top Court of the India. Though Woman like Joint Secretary (Junior of Mr. Bali, Advocate) has fully enjoyed and glorified the woman harassment while

standing at gage no.1, while the petitioner was getting harassed by the security constables at gage no.1, video has been recorded of the incident and it can be played during hearing of the petitioner with due permission of the Hon'ble Court.

And

It is further prayed that a roving inquiry may kindly be marked in the matter for upholding the dignity of the noble profession, law and to curb corrupt practices adopted by some certain hi-jackers of the system. Because every attempt has been made to ruin career and personal life of the undersigned Advocate in violation of right to privacy laid down by the Supreme Court of India in a landmark judgment **Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) vs. Union of India, on 26th September, 2018.**

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, has been judicially interpreted to include the fundamental right to live with dignity. This right extends beyond mere physical existence to encompass positive entitlements like the right to livelihood, a healthy environment, privacy, and freedom from torture and degrading treatment, ensuring a life of respect and fulfillment. Key Court cases like Maneka Gandhi vs. Union of India, have established that the protection of life under Article 21 includes the right to a dignified existence, not just the negative right of being free from unlawful killing.

And

To set precedent, kindly impose exemplary cost on respondent Nos. 1 to 5 for wasting the valuable time of this Hon'ble High Court by increasing unnecessary litigation by harassing the petitioner.

And

It is further prayed that petitioner has already filed protection petition with different reasons, which is registered and taken up by Co-ordinate Bench on 15.09.2025 and has been adjourned to 26.09.2025 without hearing because petitioner was arguing an another matter before co-ordinate Bench at this Hon'ble High Court. But due to urgency to stop everyday harassment and nuisance by Sartej Singh Narula and Gagandeep Jammu, Advocates, petitioner is compelled to file this instant Criminal Writ petition to protect the fundamental rights of the petitioner with immediate effect to stop nuisance,

harassment and exploitation of female Advocate at Punjab & Haryana High Court.

And

It is further prayed that the petitioner may kindly be exempted from filing the certified copies/typed copies of the annexures and be permitted to place on record the dim print/photocopies/translated of the same, in the interest of justice as same has been received via emails/representations.”

2. On issuance of notice to the respondents, a short reply by way of affidavit of Mr. Lakshay Pandey, DANIPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Security, Headquarters, U.T., Chandigarh, has been filed on 14.01.2026, wherein it has been disclosed that as regards fresh threat perception received by the petitioner, verification of facts was done by the Intelligence Officer. Statement of the petitioner was taken and she disclosed that she has been dismembered from the Bar Association of Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, as a result of which, she could not operate from her seat in Bar Room No.2. On cross verification of this fact from Mr. S.S.Sodhi, Advocate, with whom petitioner alleged to be sharing her table, he stated that he is neither sharing any table with the petitioner nor the petitioner is having any seat in Bar Room No.2. The Intelligence Officer also found that now, permanent residence of the petitioner is “H.No.828, Kot Khalsa, Amritsar, Punjab.” Finally, the Intelligence Officer concluded that the petitioner has not received any threat from anyone through any means at this stage. The short reply further reveals that the petitioner, on being contacted, informed that she has received threats from 500 Advocates, who are Members of the Punjab and Haryana

High Court Bar Association. The Intelligence Officer also came to know that FIR No.80 dated 17.09.2025 alleging offences punishable u/ss 115 (2), 126 (2), 109 (1), 351 (2) and 3 (5) of BNS, 2023, has been registered at Police Station, Sector-3, U.T., Chandigarh and FIR No.119 dated 24.09.2025, u/s 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, has been registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, U.T, Chandigarh, against the petitioner.

3. In the given facts and circumstances, it appears that the petitioner has some dispute against certain office bearers as well as Members of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association.

4. The appropriate forum for adjudicating and resolving such disputes is the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana. This Court was about to issue direction to the office bearers, including the President and Secretary of the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana, to constitute a committee of three Senior Advocates to resolve the dispute, but refrained from doing so since the petitioner refused to subject herself to the jurisdiction of Bar Council.

5. At this juncture, the petitioner submitted that she is not willing to submit to be subjected to any enquiry conducted by the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana.

6. In this view of the matter, this Court proceeds to decide this case on merits.

7. The essential grievance of the petitioner appears to be that she is not being provided with any police protection during

her journey to and fro between Gurugram, Delhi and Chandigarh. The petitioner also has grievance as regards the alleged misdemeanors committed by the office bears of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association.

8. In view of the above, this Court disposes of this petition with the following directions:

(i) The petitioner is directed to file a fresh application disclosing the current situation of the threat perception experienced by her, before the appropriate authority and if, the same is done within a period of 15 working days, then the police authorities shall decide the said application in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 15 days after the submission of said application.

(ii) As far as the prayer for direction for registration of offence against the office bearers of Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association is concerned, the petitioner was given an option to approach the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana, which she has declined to accept and therefore, this Court is left with no option, but to direct the petitioner to avail the remedy under the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.P.C.) or Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), which appears to have already availed by the petitioner in the shape of CRWP-2112-2026. The said

petition has already been disposed of vide order of even day passed by this Court.

9. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

**(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

March 20, 2026
Ajay Prasher

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No