

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

CRM-M-29640 of 2017.

Decided on:-16.08.2017.

Gurmeet Singh.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

Present:- Mr. Deepak Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for issuance of a direction to respondents No.1 and 2 to protect his life and liberty and a further direction to respondent No.3 as well as other respondents not to harass and humiliate the petitioner by implicating him in any false case. Prayer has also been made for issuance of a direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to give advance notice of seven days to the petitioner prior to his arrest, if any case is registered against him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that respondent No.4 Gurtej Singh has friendship with respondent No.3 Constable Gursewak Singh, who is presently posted at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib. Said Gursewak Singh has raided the house of the petitioner, but the petitioner was not present at home. The petitioner is getting threat at the hands of police officials and has come to know that the police wanted to plant a case upon him on the asking of private respondents.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Perusal of the record reveals that it has been pleaded by the petitioner himself in the present petition that earlier, a case under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 was registered against him in which he had to face conviction for a period of six months. Besides this, the petitioner had also some money dispute with respondent No.4 Gurtej Singh, who got executed a pronote from the petitioner. On the basis of said pronote, respondent No.4 had filed a suit in the Court. However, later on, the petitioner paid him the amount and the said suit was dismissed. It has also been pleaded by the petitioner that the respondent No.4 had also taken the signatures of the petitioner on three blank pronotes, and when the petitioner moved a complaint to the police, he returned two pronotes, but still one pronote has not been returned to the petitioner.

It appears that the petitioner has issued some pronote/cheque in favour of respondent No.4, though the allegation is that the blank pronote was got signed from the petitioner. In this background, when the petitioner has already been convicted and sentenced under NDPS Act and the amount involved in a suit for recovery had also been paid by him, no such blanket direction can be issued against the respondents.

Therefore, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

August 16, 2017
Yag Dutt

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether Reportable: No