

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl.Misc.No.M-3700 of 2015
Date of Decision : 14.5.2015

Dr. Virender Bansal

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

...

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

...

Present : Ms. Chhavi, Advocate for Mr. NiteshSinghi, Advocate for
the petitioner.
Mr. M.K.Sangwan,DAG, Haryana.

...

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J

Petitioner, by way of instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,
seeks directions to the official respondents to provide protection to the life
and liberty of the petitioner and his family members.

Notice of motion was issued and pursuant thereto, reply by way
of affidavit dated 10.3.2015 has been filed.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from Baljit
Singh, SI, Police Station Cheeka, Kaithal, submits that the matter has been
enquired into and the threat perception alleged by the petitioner was not
found to be subsisting, rendering the present petition as infructuous. He
refers to the averments taken in paras 1 and 2 of the preliminary
submissions, which read as under :-

“ That complaint of the petitioner against respondent

no.5 regarding threat to kidnapping the son of petitioner and protecting his life and liberty was marked for enquiry to the deponent. The deponent after conducting enquiry submitted his report vide letter No.346 dated 14.2.2014. It is found during enquiry that respondent no.5 went to Hospital of petitioner for treatment of cough on 7.2.2014 and petitioner prescribed medicines for three days. But from these medicines Sushil son of respondent no.5 did not get cure. Thereafter respondent no.5 got treated his son from Gian Sagar Hospital Banur (Pb.). Respondent no.5 made complaint to the Civil Surgeon Kaithal against the petitioner alleging therein that kidneys of his son were damaged by the medicines prescribed by the petitioner. The Deputy Civil Surgeon Kaithal submitted his report Annexure R-1 in this regard and concluded that petitioner has no role in failure of kidneys of son of respondent no.5. The petitioner is duly qualified doctor. He was not found negligent.

That from the evidence collected during enquiry it was not established that respondent no.5 was blackmailing the petitioner and from his petitioner has no danger to his life and liberty. Threat perception has also been evaluated and concern of petitioner in this regard were found not based upon facts. Accordingly the complaint of the petitioner was filed.”

On the basis of abovesaid averments, learned counsel for the State submits that the present petition has been rendered infructuous and may be disposed of, as such.

Faced with the above, learned counsel for the petitioner could not deny the factual aspect of the statement made by learned counsel for the State and rightly so, as the same is matter of record.

In view of the above, present petition is disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.

14.5.2015
GS

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE