



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

337

**CRWP-12960-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-19.02.2026**

NITIN NANDA @ NUTAN KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Pawandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Athar Ahmed, DAG, Punjab.

(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

CRM-W-206-2026

1. This is an application filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for preponing the date of hearing in the case i.e. fixed for 05.03.2026.
2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the hearing of the main petition is advanced to today and the matter is taken up for hearing.

CRWP-12960-2025

1. The prayer in the present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ, direction order in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent Nos.1 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondent Nos.5 to 8, who have fired upon the petitioner leading to the registration of the FIR No.179 dated 29.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 109, 351(2), 191(3), 190

of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Anandpur Sahib, District Ropar.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that respondent No.5 (Dilsher Singh), who is a retired DSP of the Chandigarh Police, fired upon the petitioner leading to the registration of the captioned FIR and that one of the co-accused, respondent No.6 (Ram Kumar), who is cousin of respondent No.5, is absconding. Therefore, the petitioner faces a threat to his life and he be provided security.

3. The learned counsel for the State, on instructions from SI Rakesh Kumar, has not disputed the factual position that respondent No.5 (Dilsher Singh), who is a retired DSP of the Chandigarh Police, has fired upon the petitioner leading to the registration of the FIR in question. He also admits that respondent No.6 (Ram Kumar), who is a co-accused and a cousin of respondent No.5, is absconding. He, however, states that the petitioner has been provided a PSO 24x7 and is therefore adequately protected.

4. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

5. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

19.02.2026
Kusum

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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