

CRM NO. M-16148 OF 2014

[1]

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

Sr. No.238

**CRM NO. M-16148 OF 2014
DECIDED ON: May 09, 2016**

TAJINDERPAL SINGH @ LALI

..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. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate,
for the private respondents.

JASPAL SINGH, J

This is a petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for issuance of directions to respondents No. 2 & 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members from the hands of private respondents No. 6 to 12.

The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is

CRM NO. M-16148 OF 2014

[2]

that though FIR No. 69, dated March 15, 2014, under Sections 307, 148, 149 of IPC and 25 of Arms Act, was registered at Police Station Chherretta, District Amritsar City and respondents No.6 to 12 were attributed specific role but the police during the investigation of the case has declared all the private respondents innocent and submit a cancellation report. The petitioner as well as his family members are apprehending danger at the hands of private respondents as they are moving freely in view of submission of cancellation report.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the private respondents submits that the respondents has rightly been found innocent by the police during investigation of this case as they have nothing to do with the injuries, if any, sustained by the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has other remedies available to him under law.

Instant petition has virtually rendered infructuous, in view of submission of cancellation report. However, petitioner is at liberty to have recourse to the other remedies available under law including filing of a protest petition or a regular complaint. So far as the prayer with regard to giving of direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty is concerned, a representation dated May 02, 2014 (Annexure P-6) has already been submitted to Director General of Police, Punjab as well as to Police Commissioner, Amritsar but it appears that no action has so far been taken on the said representation. Respondent No.2 is directed to conduct an enquiry

CRM NO. M-16148 OF 2014

[3]

into the allegations unfolded by the petitioner in his representation dated May 02, 2014 (Annexure P-6) and if he comes to the conclusion that there is threat perception, to provide security to the petitioner in accordance with law.

May 09, 2016

Ankur

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**