

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16930 of 2016
DECIDED ON: May 17, 2016

VIJAY KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

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?

Present: Mr. R.S. Bajaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

This is a petition preferred under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking issuance of directions to respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner, who is apprehending danger at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

2. Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 5 only, at this stage.
3. At the asking of the Court, Mr. K.S. Pannu, DAG, Punjab has accepted notice on behalf of the respondents-State. Copy of the paper book has been supplied to learned State counsel.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has *inter alia* contended that respondent No.4-ACP, Jalandhar and respondent No.5-SHO, P.S.

Jalandhar are hand-in-glove with respondent No.6, who are extending threats to the petitioner, at the instance of respondent No.6, to part with the property owned and possessed by the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that though a complaint/representation dated 29.04.2016 (Annexure P-4) was moved to Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar but till date no action has been taken. Rather, the aforesaid complaint has been marked for inquiry to respondent No.4, against whom the petitioner has already levelled allegations.

6. The instant petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2- Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar, Punjab, to get an inquiry transferred from respondent No. 4 to any other senior officer of the police posted in the district and if some substance is found, to take appropriate action in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, if, respondent No.2 finds that there is threat perception to the petitioner, he shall provide necessary protection to him.

May 17, 2016
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE