

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

**CRM No.M-393 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.01.2017**

Jagjiwan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. S.S. Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.
seeking issuance of two fold directions;

(i) Directions are sought to respondents No.1 & 2 to ensure that the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Moonak, District Sangrur/respondent No.3 hands back to the petitioner two cheques for an amount of Rs.3 lacs each dated 12.02.2017 and 15.06.2017 on the ground that these two cheques have been obtained from the petitioner on 07.12.2016 in his office at Moonak after hatching a conspiracy with respondent No.5, Gurmail Singh S/o Banta Singh.

(ii) Second prayer is for issuance of necessary directions for protection of life and liberty of the petitioner on the basis that he apprehends threat to the same at the hands of respondent No.5, Gurmail Singh.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

Insofar as the first direction sought, this Court would be handicapped to even entertain such a prayer. While exercising power under

Section 482 Cr.P.C. this Court would not embark upon a roving inquiry so as to substantiate the allegation of the petitioner that the two cheques in question had been obtained forcibly and under threat from the petitioner. Suffice it to observe that it would be open for the petitioner to avail of his remedy in such regard as may be available in accordance with law.

Insofar as the direction for protection of life and liberty is concerned, this Court without even verifying the correctness of the averments made in the petition, grants liberty to the petitioner to approach Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur to file a representation limited to the extent of seeking protection of life and liberty.

In the eventuality of any such representation being preferred, respondent No.2 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur, District Sangrur, Punjab would be obligated to examine the contents of such representation and thereafter to take steps as he may deem fit and as warranted in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

30.01.2017*harjeet***(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | No |