



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

121

CRWP-14092-2025
Decided on : 12.01.2026

KC and Company

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing respondents No.1 to 4 to ensure protection of the life and liberty of the petitioner-company and its proprietor/workers at the hands of respondent No.5.

2. As per the averments made in the petition, respondent No.5 – Nitin Kumar, issued cheque No. 000006 dated 27.11.2025 for a sum of ₹20,30,214/-, drawn on IDFC Bank, Ground Floor, SCO No.63, Panchkula, with an assurance that the cheque would be honoured upon presentation. However, upon presentation, said cheque was returned unpaid with the remarks “**Account Closed**”, vide return memo dated 01.12.2025 (Annexure P-2).

Thereafter, proprietor of the petitioner-company, namely Rajnish, contacted respondent No.5 and requested him to make payment of the said amount, as the bank account was found to have already been closed.

3. As per the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner-company, instead of making the payment, respondent No.5 allegedly started



threatening Rajnish, proprietor of the petitioner-company, with dire consequences, stating that he would kill him if he again visited his house. It is further alleged that respondent No.5 attempted to blackmail the said Rajnish by stating that he would commit suicide after leaving a suicide note blaming the petitioner-company for his death. Hence, the present petition has been filed by the petitioner-company, i.e., KC and Company.

4. When queried by the Court, learned counsel for the petitioner-company fairly concedes that an efficacious statutory remedy is available to the petitioner-company with regard to the dishonour of cheque in question; however, no such proceedings have been initiated so far.

As regards the alleged threats extended by respondent No.5 – Nitin Kumar, the same do not merit interference in the present writ petition, as no specific incident, date, or supporting material has been placed on record to substantiate such allegations. Even otherwise, if any such cause of action exists, the petitioner-company has an adequate remedy available under the law before the appropriate forum.

In view of the above, the present petition is **dismissed as not maintainable**. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner-company to avail its appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 12, 2026

J.Ram

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