

2026:PHHC:077547



124

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-12852-2025

Kulbir Singh

....Petitioner

versus

Union Territory of Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

Date of decision: May 18, 2026
Date of Uploading: May 18, 2026

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ranjit Singh Kalra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor U.T., Chandigarh,
Mr. Dixit Bhardwaj, Advocate,
Mr. Sarasmi Budhiraja, Advocate,
Ms. Swadha, Advocate and
Mr. Arjun, Advocate for the respondents – U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India
(**presence marked through video-conferencing**) with
Ms. Neha Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel
for the respondent – Union of India.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

The substantive prayer(s) made in the petition in hand read(s)
thus:

- “i) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus summoning the records of the case;
- ii) Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent No. 3 & 4 to protect the life and personal liberty of the petitioner and his family members, in light of the contents stated in the present petition, in the interest of justice;
- iii) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to provide immediately police protection to the petitioner and his family members including but not limited to deployment of Armed Police Personnel/ Commandos equipped with modern weapons for security of petitioner and his family members;

- iv) *Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to register an FIR under appropriate provisions of law against the accused Doni Bal and his accomplice based upon the complaint and threat messages/ calls, in the interest of justice.*
- v) *Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing Respondent No.1 to conduct enquiry and affix the responsibility of erring officials who have failed in taking action upon the threats which were duly brought to the notice of the authorities and have not even register a FIR though extortion calls have been received from notorious gangsters.”*

- 2. During the course of hearing, it is not in dispute that the petitioner has been afforded one PSO (Personal Security Officer) and learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is satisfied for the *nonce*.
- 3. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record, the petition in hand is **disposed of** with a direction to the Union Territory Administration, Chandigarh that in case, it deems it appropriate to withdraw the above PSO (Personal Security Officer), clear 15 days notice would be afforded to the petitioner before such effective withdrawal, so as to enable the petitioner to seek his remedy, in accordance with law.
- 4. Ordered accordingly.
- 5. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

May 18, 2026
mahavir
Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No