



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

114

**CRWP-12017-2025
Date of decision: 14.01.2026**

MUKESH KUMAR CHAUHAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Amrit Pal Sandhu, Advocate for
Mr. Jatin Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed seeking directions to respondents No.1 to 5 to protect the life, liberty and property of the petitioner who is alleged to be under imminent danger at the hands of private respondents No. 6 to 10.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner vehemently contends that the petitioner has been serving as the President of Platinum Homes Society, Dhakoli for the last three years and has been discharging his duties diligently in accordance with applicable rules and bye laws. He contends that private respondent No.10, principal opponent of the petitioner, was being openly and aggressively supported by respondents

No.6 and 7. Having lost out in the elections, the respondents harbored grudge against the petitioner. A threatening message was circulated by the private respondents to the effect that they will not allow the petitioner to move in the society or out of his office alive. He contends that the respondent-accused persons caused assault of the petitioner which culminated into registration of FIR No. 0091 dated 09.09.2025 registered under Section 109, 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 190, 191(3) and 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 (Section 117(2) of BNS was added later on). Some of the respondents were later granted anticipatory bail by the trial Court. It is argued with vehemence that the petitioner is being threatened by the private respondents since then.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has been called upon to refer to the material in support of the argument being advanced and with respect to the specific date when such threat was being extended to the petitioner and also to refer to any overt act that may have taken place as a result thereof.

4. Counsel for the petitioner has not been able to refer to any material on the basis whereof, the apprehension expressed in the present petition can be corroborated by any overt act or omission which may be attributable to the respondents.

5. A perceptive fear of an individual cannot be equated to that of a threat being extended by the other party. Where the perception is not corroborated by any material as would objectively make this Court believe that there is a real interception of threat to the life, liberty and property of an individual, the directions as have been sought for would not be ordinarily issued.

6. The directions to the respondents-authorities to take action against private respondents on purported threat are not issued as a matter of course but may be only in those circumstances where such threat is real and is based on tangible material which is *prima facie* admissible.
7. Apart from pompous expressions used, the allegations levelled are not corroborated by any tangible material.
8. Finding no merit, the present petition is dismissed at this stage.

JANUARY 14, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No