

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAAT
CHANDIGARH**

Crl. Misc. No.M- 2886 of 2015(O&M)

Date of Decision: February 27, 2015.

Rajinder Singh

..... PETITIONER (s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... RESPONDENT (s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Jagraj Singh Khiva, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surjeet S.Chaudhary, DAG, Punjab.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

LISA GILL, J.

Notice of motion in this case had been issued to respondents No.1 to 3 only to the limited extent for protection of life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondents No.4 to 13. Respondent No.2 had been directed to look into the representation dated 31.10.2014 in respect to the petitioner's prayer for protection of his life and liberty. It was directed that necessary steps as may be required should be taken.

Reply by way of affidavit dated 26.02.2015 of Janak Singh PPS,

Deputy Superintendent of Police, Maur on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 has been filed in Court today. The same is taken on record subject to all just exceptions. A joint statement of all the private respondents No.4 to 13 (to whom notice had not been issued) has been appended with the said reply wherein they have stated that the Goldsmith Union takes absolute responsibility that no member of the said union would misbehave with the petitioner in future and would not interfere in his business or forcibly prevent his employees from working with him. It is also stated that the union or its member has never ever interfered in his business or ever forcibly prevented him or his employee from running his business and neither the petitioner has been threatened by them.

It is stated in the abovesaid affidavit that there is no danger to the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of said respondents. In case there is any such apprehension in future, immediate and necessary shall be taken.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petition has been rendered infructuous at this stage in view of the reply filed on behalf of the State.

Disposed of accordingly.

February 27, 2015.
'om'

(**LISA GILL**)
JUDGE