

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

251

CRM-M-18874-2018

Date of Decision:31.07.2018

Darshan Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. SPS Sidhu, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surinder Pal Singh Tinna, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 to 4 to provide adequate security to the petitioner as well as his family members as the petitioner apprehends serious threat to his life and liberty.

Learned State Counsel has filed short reply by way of affidavit of Sh. Paramdip Singh Sandhu, AIG, Security Punjab. The norms and guidelines for providing security find mention in the State Security Policy notified by the Government of Punjab on 02.09.2013. The relevant rules read as under:-

*“Police officers are recruited, trained and maintained at a huge cost borne by the taxpayer, and are, therefore, meant to be deployed for the protection of the community. Providing police officers to individuals for their protection at the cost of taxpayer is not the function of the State or the government.....”*

*“Thus personal protection at State expense was always meant to be an exception, and not the rule. Personal security is only meant to be given to individuals who are facing a grave threat to their life from terrorist and militant outfits, or organized criminal syndicates and gangs, as laid down in the Yellow Book issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, in December 2003.....”*

Learned State Counsel has referred paragraph 7 of the affidavit which reads as under:-

*“That is is humbly submitted that as per the procedure and guidelines laid down in the State Security policy, fresh threat perception reports have been obtained from the DGP Intelligence, Punjab and from the local police i.e. SSP, Ferozepur.”*

Taking into consideration the affidavit so submitted by Sh. Paramdip Singh Sandhu, AIG, Security Punjab, it has been revealed that there are no specific threat inputs which may indicate any threat perception to the security of the petitioner.

In the given circumstances, threat perception can only be visualized by the Security Wing and in the case in hand, it has been reported that there is no specific threat as on date to the petitioner. Therefore, he cannot be extended any security.

The present petition is dismissed, at this stage.

**July 31, 2018**  
seema

**(HARI PAL VERMA)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No