



2026:PHHC:073680

2026:PHHC:073680



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

109

**CRWP-4124-2026
Date of decision: 11.05.2026**

PRADEEP KUMAR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed for seeking protection of life and liberty of the petitioner at the behest of respondents No.4 and 5 and for restraining the said respondents from harassing, threatening, intimidating or taking coercive action against him.

2. It is alleged in the petition that respondent No.4, who is the Inspector General of Police of the Special Task Force, Haryana had been extending undue protection to respondent No.5 and threatening the petitioner (who is husband of respondent No.5) to vacate the premises and with false implication. Since the petitioner has levelled allegations against senior functionary in the Police Department, hence, status report was sought for.

3. In compliance to the said order, reply by way of an affidavit of



B. Satheesh Balan, IPS, Inspector General of Police, Special Task Force, Haryana has been filed. It has been averred in the said affidavit that the petitioner has concealed material facts from this Court. It is submitted that on the same allegations, the petitioner had earlier filed *CRWP-3715 of 2026* titled "*Pardeep Kumar versus State of Haryana*" which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 06.04.2026 directing the respondent No.2-Director General of Police, Haryana to look into the representation dated 26.03.2026 and to decide the same in accordance with law by passing a speaking order within a period of three weeks. Pursuant thereto, the Director General of Police, Haryana also sought the comments of the respondent No.4, who had also been impleaded as a party in the said petition. The same have been duly furnished. It is further averred that actually, one FIR No. 74 dated 12.03.2024 had been registered under Section 323/452/376(b)/506 IPC, Police Station Sadar, Sonipat which was lodged by Kiran-respondent No.5 (wife of the petitioner herein). A thorough, fair and impartial investigation was conducted and the FIR was recommended for cancellation by the SHO on 01.06.2024. The deponent-respondent No.4 was then posted as Commissioner of Police, Sonipat. It is averred that the said respondent has no role in the marital discord of the petitioner and respondent No.5 and that the action taken was strictly in accordance with law. It is further averred that the petitioner had also moved CRM-M-14381-2024 titled "*Pardeep Kumar versus State of Haryana*". The said petition was disposed of on 30.04.2024 by the High Court directing the petitioner to appear before the Commissioner of Police on 01.05.2024 to address his grievances whereupon the Commissioner of Police (respondent No.4) was to look personally into the matter and take necessary action.



4. In compliance thereto, the petitioner as well as respondent No.5 appeared before the said deponent-respondent No.4 on 01.05.2024. The said deponent counseled both the parties and persuaded them to resolve their matrimonial issues amicably. The respondent No.5 blamed the petitioner for harassing her and not allowing her to settle peacefully and also reiterated her willingness that she could join the petitioner if he undertook not to harass or subject her to cruelty. An assurance in this regard was given by the petitioner herein that he would take his wife back and extend due and proper treatment to her. Based on this assurance and the efforts made during counseling, the parties resumed cohabitation. There was no further involvement of respondent No.4-deponent in the said matrimony but only in compliance to the order passed by this High Court. In March, 2026, respondent No.5 approached the deponent-respondent No.4 complaining that the petitioner had resumed harassment whereupon the deponent-respondent No.4 merely contacted the petitioner and advised him to resolve their issues but there was no threat or coercion. It has also been pointed out that the petitioner has alleged about the officials of Police having visited him. It has been submitted that the said officials namely Naresh Dalal and SI Yashvir were not part of STF but are posted in Crime Unit in Sector-27, Sonipat and that it was informed that there was a video showing the petitioner firing a gunshot at a public place. Accordingly, ASI Naresh and HC Sanjay visited the chamber of the petitioner for enquiry but he was not present. The said aspect was only in furtherance of the enquiry being conducted with respect to the video of the petitioner firing shots. Counsel does not dispute that some of the aforesaid facts including institution of the earlier petition has not been disclosed by the petitioner in the present petition. He does not dispute that



the petitioner herein is a practicing Advocate and he is definitely aware of the necessity of a complete and fair disclosure of all prior petitions that had been instituted by him. Since the averments contained in the affidavit are not disputed by the petitioner and the element of concealment of fact is evident, Counsel does not press the instant petition and seeks withdrawal thereof.

5. While allowing the petitioner to withdraw the present petition, this Court feels it necessary to impose some cost on the petitioner for having concealed vital information from this Court only to set the process of law in motion. Hence, a cost of **Rs. 10,000/-** is imposed upon the petitioner to be deposited with ***“Red Cross Old Age Home ,A/c No.50100286016319, IFS Code HDFC0004030, HDFC Bank, Sector 15, Panchkula”***.

6. Disposed of as withdrawn.

MAY 11, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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