



114

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

CRWP-10271-2025

DECIDED ON: 27.01.2026

MANJIT KAUR AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Ms. Divya Gulati, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioners seeking issuance of direction to the official respondents, to protect their life and liberty from the hands of private respondent Nos.5 to 12.
2. On 24.09.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“Present criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of directions to respondent No. 2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from respondents No. 5 to 12 and the subordinate staff of respondent No. 4, who are harassing and threatening the petitioners of dire consequences at the instance of respondents No. 6 to 12.

Learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon CCTV footage recording which has been placed on record by the petitioner in the form of Pen Drive (Annexure P-6) and submits that the private respondents have ransack their house and rather made impossible for the petitioner to stay therein. They have already made a complaint/representation to the police authorities (Annexure P-5) but no action is being taken to protect the rights of the petitioners.

Let Pen Drive be examined by the concerned respondents and then the status report be filed in view of the allegations made in the petition as well as the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners.

A copy of the another Pen Drive containing the recording (which is annexed as Annexure P-6) would be handed over by the petitioner to the concerned SHO of the Police Station within two days from today.

Adjourned to 12.11.2025. "

3. Status report dated 13.11.2025 filed by official respondent Nos.1 to 4 is already there on record. Paragraph Nos.3, 4 and 5 of the said status report reads as under:-

“3. That during the enquiry, it was found that the petitioners had formed one Finance Group, who cheated co-villagers by giving them an inducement of higher interest on the investment in their finance group and case FIR No. 101 dated 24.08.2024 under section 420 and 120-B IPC was registered at Police Station Khilchian, Amritsar (Rural) against the petitioner No. 2 for cheating an amount of Rs. 36 Lakh on the basis of the complaint filed by Sarabjit Singh and FIR No. 100 dated 24.08.2024 under section 420 and 120-B IPC was registered at Police Station Khilchian against the petitioner No. 2 for cheating of an amount of Rs. 27,84,000/- on the basis of the complaint of Parminder Singh.

4. That it has been further reported that during the enquiry, it has been found that the respondent No. 6, 7 had paid Rs. 6 Lakh, respondent No. 8, 9 had paid Rs. 6 Lakh and the respondents No. 10, 11 and 12 had paid an amount of Rs. 3 Lakh to the petitioner No. 2 but the petitioner had not returned their amount despite of repeated requests made by them.

5. That it has been further reported that Haveli of the petitioners is under the possession of the petitioners and after examining the CCTV footage presented by the petitioner through Pen-Drive, it has been found that Surjit Singh had broken window panes of the house of the petitioner with brickbats but as per the medical record produced by the family members of Surjit Singh, it was found that Surjit Singh suffered from neurological problem.”

4. From the status report, it emerges that allegations of cheating of co-villagers already exist against petitioner No.2, namely Sarabjit Singh, and FIR No.101 dated 24.08.2024 as well as FIR No.100 dated 24.08.2024 under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC were registered at Police Station Khilchian, Amritsar (Rural), against him.

It further emerges that respondent No.8, namely Surjit Singh @ Soni, is stated to have broken the window panes of the petitioners' house with brickbats; however, as per the medical record produced by his family members, he was also suffering from neurological problems.

5. As regards the protection of life and liberty of the person(s) concerned, the State has already assured in its reply/status report that it is duty-bound to protect the same.

6. In view of the stand taken in the status report, which has been discussed here above, this Court does not find any substance for issuance of any direction as sought in the present petition. Accordingly, present petition is **dismissed**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

27.01.2026

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>