

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

CRM-M No.11262 of 2017
Date of Decision: 03.04.2017

Ashok Kumar

-Petitioner

VS

State of Haryana and others

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. B.S. Jaswal, Advocate for
Mr. Sutikshan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to respondents No.1 to 4 in the context of providing protection qua his life and personal liberty from being invaded by the private respondents No.5 to 10.

Petitioner is a Sarpanch. An incident of 18.01.2017 has been quoted to allege malafide against private respondents to the effect that they are instrumental in giving repeated threats to the petitioner.

Precisely for the grievance in question, a representation has been moved by the petitioner before respondent No.3 on 19.01.2017 but the same has not been decided so far.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ripudaman, A.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4.

At this stage, in view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of filing any reply to the petition as no order prejudicial to interest of any of the party is being passed.

This petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to look into the grievance of the petitioner in context of his representation. If some cognizable offence is found to have been committed, then respondent No.4 can be asked to act in accordance with law. If no substance is found in the allegations of the petitioner, then the petitioner can be informed in view of parameters as laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

03.04.2017
jyoti Y.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No