

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

2025:PHHC:066357



162

CRM-M-27528-2025

Date of decision: 19.05.2025

Baltej Singh and Ors.

...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Ms. Madhu Bala, Advocate and
Mr. J.S. Moudgill, Advocate for the petitioners.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J.(ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, is for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 3 to comply with provision of Section 160 of Cr.P.C. (now Section 179 of BNSS) read with Section 41 Cr.P.C. (now Section 35 of BNSS) and to give at least 7 days advance notice to the petitioners in writing, in case they are required in connection with any enquiry/investigation in a criminal case, along with further prayer for directing respondent Nos.2 and 3 to prevent respondent No.4 from calling the petitioners again and again to the police station.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that son of petitioner No.1 had gone to Canada on 09.04.2023. The petitioners had taken loan from their relatives and friends to fulfill the dreams of his son, who was residing in Surrey at Canada. Being annoyed with his parents over

not fulfilling his demands of money, Jaspreet Singh, who had returned to India, not only threatened the petitioner No.1 but inflicted a blow with wooden block on the head of petitioner No.1 and ran away from the spot. It is submitted that on 21.04.2025, petitioners received a phone call from respondent No.4 asking them to come at police station on 22.04.2025 and produce their son. When petitioners went to the police chowki Handiaya on 22.04.2025, respondent No.4 abused them on the pretext that either he would produce his son or would be implicated in a false case. It was reported by respondent No.4 that Jaspreet Singh-son of the petitioners had committed murder in Canada and a look out notice was issued against him. Now the petitioners are being repeatedly harassed by the police officials by being called to the police station time and again. Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners filed representation dated 25.04.2025 (Annexure P-2) before respondent No.2, but till date no action has been taken.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners stated that he would be satisfied, in case, the pending representation (Annexure P-2) is decided by respondent No.2.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice and submitted that she has no objection if the aforesaid representation dated 25.04.2025 (Annexure P-2) is decided.

In view of the above, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2—Senior Superintendent of Police, Barnala, to look into the representation dated 25.04.2025 (Annexure P-2), at the earliest, regarding threat perception and take necessary steps, if any required, in accordance with law, to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is

not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondent No.4. However, it will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

19.05.2025

jjyoti3

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No