

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-17103 of 2017

.....

Date of decision:16.5.2017

Tajinder Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Chandana, Advocate for the petitioner.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of a direction to the official respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner from the private respondents No.6 to 8 by providing police protection to the petitioner and further direction be issued to respondents No.2 and 3 not to harass the petitioner illegally at the behest of respondents No.6 to 8 and other relatives.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that in the representation it is stated that complaints against Civil Surgeon, Ludhiana Santokh Vema, his wife Anita Sharma and his son Rishi Vema, who is practising as a doctor without having any medical degree, have been filed by Tajinder Singh. It is in the representation that the petitioner is receiving threatening calls from some

[2]

unknown number and Santokh Verma has also sent threatening messages on his face book page. It is also in the representation that when the petitioner visited the Police Station Division No.8, Ludhiana, to make complaint against Santokh Verma, his wife and son, then the SHO misbehaved with him and threatened to kill him and asked him to withdraw his complaints or to make compromise and he also threatened to implicate him in some false case.

A perusal of the record shows that no specific particulars have been mentioned in the representation when the threatening calls were given. There is nothing as to from which telephone number calls were received. I have gone through Annexure-P.6 stated to be photo copy of the face book page. A perusal of the record including this face book page no where shows that there is any serious threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner regarding which he should be provided police protection.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and from the record, I do not find it a fit case where the police protection is provided to the petitioner to protect his life and liberty.

Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

May 16, 2017.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No