

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

CRM-M-11091 of 2016.
Decided on:-31.03.2016.

Parwinder Kumar Gupta and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

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

Present:- Mr. Gurbir Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed the present petition praying for protection of their life and liberty as they are getting threat at the hands of respondents No.5 and 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in the month of October, 2015, respondents No.5 and 6 took a loan of Rs.1,60,000/- from the petitioners and when the petitioners had asked them for repayment of said amount, they refused to return the same and the petitioners are being threatened by respondents No.5 and 6. The petitioners have approached the

SHO concerned as well as the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, but the police has also not extended any help to them.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Perusal of the paper book shows that respondent No.6 Saroj Bala is cousin sister of petitioner No.1 Parwinder Kumar Gupta and in the month of October, 2015, respondents No.5 and 6 had taken loan of Rs.1,60,000/- from the petitioners, but the said amount has not been repaid so far. As such, the very basis of filing the present petition is regarding repayment of loan amount. The allegation of threat has been levelled in the background of monetary transaction between the parties. In these circumstances, no direction for protection of life and liberty of the petitioners can be issued under Section 482 Cr.PC.

In view of the above, this Court finds that filing of the present petition is nothing but a pressure tactics directing the private respondents to repay the loan amount and such like dispute can only be resolved by way of resorting civil remedy. Accordingly, the present petition, being devoid of any merit, is dismissed.

March 31, 2016
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE