

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

236

**CRM -M No. 21931 of 2017
Date of Decision: 07.11.2017**

DILBAGH SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. J.S. Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

Seen the reply sent up on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3.

It has been mentioned therein that after receipt of the report regarding security threat to the petitioner and his brother, one gunman has been provided to each of them permanently. Thereafter in compliance of this Court's earlier directions, another Security personnel namely PHC Ashok Kumar, No. 864/Yamuna Nagar has been additionally provided to the petitioner for round the clock security vide order dated 16.10.2017 (Annexure R-10).

To that extent, in the opinion of this Court the petitioner's prayer for providing adequate security to himself and his brother as made in the application originally would appear to be properly addressed.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner however, submits that the serious threat to his other family members including school going children still remains, which was also referred to in the earlier report of the S.H.O., P.S. Yamuna Nagar, and that appropriate provision in this regard also ought to

be made.

It may be observed at this juncture that after the personal security issues of the petitioner and his brother have been satisfactorily addressed, it is presumed that the Police Authorities would also be aware of the threat perception of the petitioner's other family members. This Court cannot assume the role of a subject expert for the purpose of assessing as to exactly, how many personnel or in what form the security apparatus for the petitioner's family members would have to be provided. Such assessment followed by appropriate action to ensure the security of the petitioner's family members is best left to the Authorities concerned.

The matter is, therefore, disposed off with a direction upon the respondents No. 2 and 3 to be cognizant of the threat perception to the petitioner's family members and thereafter, do the needful to ensure their protection.

November 07, 2017
Jyoti-IV

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No