

CWP No.14843 of 2017

[1]

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

**CWP No.14843 of 2017
Date of decision:12.07.2017**

Bhupinder Chaudhary

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Harish Mehla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

This petition is filed for seeking a direction to the respondents to provide police protection to the petitioner.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is the Regional Head of the Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC). He is allegedly facing threat to his life from the gang of anti-social elements operating in the area of Kalka and Pinjore. The petitioner has been attacked several times by the said anti-social elements because of the reason that he had allegedly made several representations to the police authorities about the nefarious activities of the said gang, operating under the name and style of SMG Group. It is alleged that the petitioner was attacked by Yograj @ Pinki, who is the son of local BJP leader Sucha Singh, Chairman of the Market Committee, Kalka. In regard to that incident, the petitioner got registered FIR No.79 dated 05.03.2017, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 307, 506 IPC, at Police

Station Pinjore. It is also alleged that there are many cases pending against the said Yograj @ Pinki and some other persons, who are alleged to be his friends.

It is also submitted that protection was earlier granted to the petitioner with one guard but it was lateron withdrawn by the ACP, Kalka, vide his letter dated 06.06.2017. It is alleged that since the aforesaid Yograj @ Pinki has not been arrested in the aforesaid FIR case, got registered by the petitioner, therefore, it has been prayed that the direction may be issued to the respondents to provide him police protection.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and examined the available record with his able assistance.

It appears that at one point of time, the petitioner was granted interim protection, as alleged, which was lateron withdrawn because of lack of threat perception. The State cannot provide police protection to every person who has been allegedly in conflict with some other person/accused in some case until and unless the threat perception is so glaring and imminent. The petitioner has got registered FIR No.79 dated 05.03.2017 against the alleged accused therein and the concerned police is making inquiries there into and would definitely reach to a conclusion about the truth involved therein.

Insofar as the present petition is concerned, I do not find any reason to provide police protection to the petitioner and hence, the same is hereby dismissed being denuded of any merit.

July 12, 2017
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

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