

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

CWP-3757-2019

Date of decision : 11.02.2019

Bhalender Yadav

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr.S.P.Yadav , Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the instant writ petition seeking quashing of the order dated 26.11.2018 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Additional Director General of Police (ADGP), CID, Haryana and in terms of which the gunman that had been provided for purposes of security cover to the petitioner has been withdrawn.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard.

Pleadings on record would indicate that the petitioner had strained relations with his wife. He had filed a divorce petition in the year 2014 on the grounds of adultery and cruelty. Decree of divorce was granted on 16.11.2016.

Petitioner is stated to have received threatening calls from the relatives and close associates of his wife. Under such circumstances petitioner moved an application for assignment of a gunman/PSO on 30.09.2015 to the District & Sessions Judge, Narnaul and acting upon such application on 31.10.2015 a gunman was detailed.

Perusal of the order dated 20.12.2018 at Annexure P-2 would

reveal that the matter of threat perception had since been reviewed and the Deputy Superintendent of Police concerned had conducted an inquiry. Initially it had been found that there was apprehension to the life of the applicant/present petitioner from his in-laws and their friends/associates and accordingly a gunman had been provided in the year 2015. Petitioner has remained under police protection since 2015 till 27.11.2018. The matter having been reviewed by the authorities concerned in pursuance to a confidential exercise it was found that for a period of more than two years no complaint or threat has been received by the applicant/petitioner. Such factual premise is even conceded by counsel during the course of hearing today.

There is no material on record for this Court to take a different view in the matter.

No merit.

Dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

February 11, 2019
sunita

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