CNR No: PHHC011015912026
2026:PHHC:185651

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No. 7390 of 2026 (O&M)
Reserved on: 03.09.2026
Pronounced on: 06.10.2026
Uploaded on : 06.10.2026

Ravneet Kaur

…Petitioner

VS

Kanwardeep Kaur and others

…Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Argued by: Petitioner in person (through video conference).

Mr. Rajiv Vij, Addl. PP., UT Chandigarh.

****

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J

The present petition, instituted under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, prays for the following substantive relief:

> ***"Criminal Writ petition Under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India Read with Article 14,19,21 of Constitution of India to seek indulgence of this High Court to enforce and protect fundamental rights of the Petitioner violated by so called SSP UT Chandigarh through her/his subordinates SHO PS 3 NORTH 1 and High Court Chownki incharge by issuing writ of mandamus and writ of prohibition by issuing notice to concerned SSP to come present in the Court in person and explain why she is personally troubling the Petitioner by misusing her uniform status and not applying her legal mind in any of the issue escalated by so called former secretary Gagandeep jammu because it seems from the conduct of the so called SSP that she want to wage a war with the petitioner and got a contract to trouble to the petitioner. It is so unfortunate that Chandigarh got such incapable SSP who is not even capable to resolve an open and shut case she rather preferred to blackmail the petitioner (the vulnerable women) by registration of two false FIR's vide***

REKHA SHARMA
2026.10.06 18:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

dated 17.09.2025 and 21.09.2025 through SHO Narinder Patial (suspended multiple times), SHO Eram Rizvi (surprisingly till date no chargesheet which is violation of settled law established by centre govt known as BNSS, 2023) but she till date sitting over the complaint of petitioner moved vide dated 11.09.2025 because madam is on duty of only VIP's and influential people. Such act & conduct of the madam raise concern that whether she has actually cracked UPSC and entered into profession by genuine means as he is unable to follow rules & regulations and literally in the state of mind that what is Constitution, I am SSP I can do anything. She is unable or she does not want to understand that this High Court is not under the control of Bar Association. Hon'ble Chief Justice of this High Court is custodian of the High Court but VIP service Madam has banned the entry of the petitioner through gate no.1 to 5 stating that secretary of the HCBA Gagandeep jammu now parampreet singh (who gave merciless beatings to the associate Advocate hurled abuses related to mother sister, attempted mob lynching of the petitioner and her associate Advocate, circulated false information on social media and befooled the authorities, forged legal documents of the petitioner, stole personal laptop with office bag of the petitioner etc.) but again madam being at VIP service rather lodge FIR against criminals impleaded and arrested the victim of the merciless beatings whose dastar (Dumala) was desecrated by the Gagandeep jammu and his party. Till date no legal action against Such incapable and criminal mind SSP is a bad example for the society and a valid reason for the this VIP madam do not hurt the criminals she started threating and defaming the victims that why are you reporting crime? Even if somebody exercising constitutional right by protest against any wrongdoer this VIP madam do not nab the wrongdoer, she serves merciless beatings and false FIR to the protestor.

And

REKHA SHARMA
2026.10.06 18:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

> ***It is further prayed that kindly suspend the services of such corrupt SSP with immediate effect and stop her salary and other benefits being at service of only VIP's and influential people."***

2. It has been averred in the petition that the petitioner, who is a regular practicing Advocate at the Punjab and Haryana High Court and is a member of Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association since 12.12.2022, is a victim of sexual offences, the trials with regard to which are pending. The petitioner has, in the petition, expressed grievances against respondent No. 1 who has been impleaded by name. The allegation is that respondent No. 1 is glorifying the victimization of the petitioner, and is on a mission to wage a war against her without verification of facts and circumstances.

2.1. It has been alleged that false FIRs were registered against the petitioner by respondent No. 1 on 17.09.2025 and 21.09.2025, and that till date no charge sheet has been filed. It has been alleged that the intention of respondent No. 1 is criminal and she wants to blackmail the petitioner through false FIRs with a view to malign her image.

2.2. It has been averred that since 2023, the petitioner has been moving complaints of blackmailing, extortion, attempt to murder, social media trolling etc., but respondent No. 1 has been sitting over the same. It has been alleged that instead of legal action being taken on the said complaints, respondent No. 1 has started blackmailing the petitioner and the judiciary in pending cases stating that since the petitioner has moved many complaints, no action is being taken.

2.3. It has further been alleged that respondent No. 1 has poisoned her colleagues and the DGP Union Territory Chandigarh at the behest of

REKHA SHARMA
2026.10.06 18:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

criminals who have forged legal documents of the petitioner as regards her membership of High Court Bar Association which led to her illegal restraint in the High Court and registration of two false FIRs, apart from illegal detention and merciless beatings to the associate of the petitioner. Certain allegations have also been leveled against the then Secretary of the Bar Association, namely Mr. Gagandeep Jammu.

2.4. Very strong adjectives have been used both against respondent No. 1 and Shri Gagandeep Jammu.

2.5. It is the case of the petitioner that having been left with no other option, she has instituted the present petition for the protection of her life and liberty as also fundamental rights against the atrocities committed by respondent No. 1.

3. On the directions of the Court, respondent No. 1 filed an affidavit denying all allegations. As regards the FIRs registered against the petitioner, it has been submitted that in FIR No. 80 dated 17th September 2025 registered at Police Station North, Sector 3, Chandigarh under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 109 (1), 351(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023, investigation has been completed and final report has been prepared, which is pending with the prosecution branch for scrutiny. FIR No. 119 dated 24.9.2025 registered under Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station Cyber Crime Chandigarh was registered upon a complaint made by Sh. Gagandeep Jammu, General Secretary of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association.

3.1. It has been averred that the allegations leveled by the petitioner are reckless, palpably wrong and baseless. It has been submitted that a quashing petition was filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 119 (ibid) and

REKHA SHARMA
2026.10.06 18:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CRM-M 64294 of 2025 was dismissed on 17.11.25 (Annexure R-1). All other averments have been denied and strong exception has been taken to the language used in the petition.

3.2. It has also been averred that from 2023 to 2026, the petitioner submitted around 191 complaints, among which 30 were pertaining to FIR No. 80 (ibid), 98 complaints were with regard to FIR No. 13 (ibid), and 55 complaints were as regards other matters. It has been averred that presently only two complaints are pending under inquiry, which will also be finalized earliest in accordance with law.

4. The petitioner and learned counsel for the Union Territory Chandigarh were heard. On the directions of the Court, respondent No. 1 also caused appearance through VC in another matter, wherein the Court interacted with her as regards the present case also.

5. It was strenuously argued by the petitioner that the actions of respondent No. 1 are illegal and arbitrary. Reference was made to the contents of the petition and the documents attached therewith. Reference was made to the representation Annexure P-1 and orders passed by the High Court from time to time.

6. *Per contra*, it was submitted by learned Additional P.P., Union Territory, Chandigarh that the petition is frivolous and defamatory.

7. I have considered the submissions made by the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondent.

8. If one goes through the heading of the petition and the contents thereof, it becomes manifestly clear that the petitioner has not maintained the discipline and decorum that is required while averring facts in a petition to be filed in a court of law. She, being an Advocate, should have been more

REKHA SHARMA
2026.10.06 18:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

circumspect and careful in making such averments. Respondent No. 1 is a Senior Police Officer and any grievance against an officer/authoring has to be phrased in a manner that does not violate the barriers and the boundaries. Same are the observations as regards the averments made against the then Secretary of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association Mr. Gagandeep Jammu. The language used is strongly deprecated.

9. Reverting to the facts of the case, it has been stated by respondent No. 1 in the affidavit filed before this Court that only two out of the innumerable complaints submitted by the petitioner remain pending, which too shall be decided in the near future. Two FIRs stand registered against her, in which, law shall take its own course.

10. Having gone through the petition carefully and having considered the arguments addressed by both sides, this Court is of the firm opinion that the allegations against respondent No.1 and Sh. Gagandeep Jammu are unsubstantiated and baseless and the petition is completely bereft of merit. In the name of protection of life and personal liberty and Article 21 of the Constitution of India, no one can be permitted to abuse the process of law.

11. As a consequence, the instant petition stands dismissed.

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

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Pronounced on: 06.10.2026
Rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

REKHA SHARMA
2026.10.06 18:51
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document