



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

Sr. No.242

**CRWP-11420-2025
Date of Decision: 30.04.2026**

SITAL SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Petitioner-in-person.

Mr. Ankur Bali, Addl. Public Prosecutor
for respondents No.1 and 3-U.T. Chandigarh.

Mr. Ritu Raj Singh, DAG, Punjab
for respondent No.2-State.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 175(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking protection of life, liberty and property of the petitioner from the hands of the private respondents. The petitioner has further prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to register an FIR against the private respondents for the commission of cognizable offences. Additionally, directions have also been sought for conducting a lie detector/polygraph test of the petitioner as well as the private respondents under court supervision.

2. Briefly, the case of the petitioner is that he is a law-abiding citizen and is professionally working as an MCA Software Engineer. It is



alleged that ever since his marriage with respondent No. 4, the private respondents have persistently harassed, blackmailed, extorted and threatened him, including making repeated demands for transfer of his property and bank balances. It is further alleged that respondent No. 9, stated to be an influential political person, in connivance with other private respondents, has misused his position to intimidate and physically assault the petitioner and to shield the private respondents from legal action.

3. The petitioner has also averred that he was forced to leave his ancestral residence due to continuous threats and coercive attempts to dispossess him of his property, and that certain properties belonging to him have been illegally possessed by the private respondents. It is further submitted that despite approaching various authorities, including filing complaints before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chandigarh, Human Rights Commission and the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh no effective action has been taken.

4. Learned State counsel has filed a detailed status report by way of affidavit, wherein it has been submitted that multiple complaints made by the petitioner were duly inquired into by the police authorities. It is stated that the petitioner failed to join the inquiry despite being duly informed through mobile and email. The inquiries conducted revealed that the allegations levelled by the petitioner were vague, unsubstantiated and, in several instances, found to be false. It has further been submitted that some of the complaints were closed on the basis of inquiry reports, and in certain cases, the matter was also found to be pending before the learned Magistrate.

It is also averred that the petitioner has not been residing at the address

provided by him and even his whereabouts could not be ascertained during inquiry.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court finds that the representations made by the petitioner have already been considered and disposed of by the competent authorities. So far as the prayer for protection of life and liberty is concerned, it is apparent that the petitioner has failed to furnish a correct and verifiable address. Even today, the petitioner has appeared in person before this Court, however, upon being specifically asked, he has failed to give any satisfactory reply regarding his place of residence. In the absence of any definite address of the petitioner, no specific or effective direction can be issued by this Court for ensuring protection of his life and liberty.

6. Accordingly, no ground is made out for interference in the present petition. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to avail appropriate remedies in accordance with law, including filing a fresh petition seeking protection of life and liberty, if the cause of action still survives and upon furnishing proper particulars.

7. The present petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

30.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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