

CRWP-11190-2025

1

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


122

**CRWP-11190-2025  
Decided on: 14.01.2026**

**Dharminder Singh****.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH****Present: Mr. S.S. Majithia, Advocate for the petitioner.****\*\*\*\*****SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

1. Present criminal writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking the issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members from the private respondents and their associates. It is alleged that the private respondents are pressurizing the petitioner not to file a complaint against them, as they had sold their property, against proper consideration, in the name of the petitioner's wife, namely Karamjit Kaur. Subsequently, a false and frivolous FIR No. 129 dated 30.08.2025, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, and 120-B IPC, was registered against her and others at Police Station Sadar Ahmedgarh.

2. As per the representation appended to the petition and addressed to the SSP, Malerkotla (P-2), petitioner's wife had purchased certain property for a sum of Rs. 9,50,000/-. Thereafter, FIR No. 129 dated 30.08.2025, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, and 120-

**CRWP-11190-2025****2**

B IPC, was registered at Police Station Sadar Ahmedgarh. The wife of the petitioner has already been released on interim bail by this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner, being the husband of Karamjit Kaur, who is accused in the aforementioned FIR, apprehends that he may be implicated at the instance of the local police. Accordingly, he moved the representation and filed the instant petition.

4. However, such a prayer, which is not supported by any admissible evidence, cannot be entertained by exercising writ jurisdiction under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India. Moreover, there is no provision under the relevant law for deciding the representation of the petitioner in this regard. Therefore, present petition is dismissed as not maintainable.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**14.01.2026**  
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**  
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**