

120

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

**COCP No.1937 of 2019
Date of Decision: 02.09.2019**

Rajbir Sharma

Petitioner

Versus

S.S. Srivastava, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Amritsar and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Dishant Rishi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Puri, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order of this Court. It is pleaded that in spite of directions passed by this Court, sufficient security cover is not being provided to the petitioner.

Pursuant to the order dated 14.08.2019, Mr. Jagjit Singh Walia, Additional Deputy Commissioner (City-I), Amritsar is present in the Court and states that it is not the Station House Officer, who takes decision with regard to extent of security to be granted. It is submitted that the Station House Officer only provides the inputs and decision is taken at a higher level. He submits that the department, in no case, would like to compromise with the security, in case of threat, if any, to the petitioner and his family members. He further

submits that a periodical review of threat perception would be undertaken and as per the inputs and the security cover, if so required would be provided.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that there is no latest review of the threat perception and the security cover as ordered earlier, is not being provided in which 10 police personnels were deputed to provide the security cover.

Learned State counsel states that review with regard to security threat perception would be undertaken within 10 days from today. The order would be passed, same would be communicated to the petitioner, security cover, if required, would be provided. Meantime, the department would continue with the security cover already provided.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks liberty to avail remedies if aggrieved of order passed reviewing the threat perception.

The contempt petition is disposed of in view of above terms, with liberty as prayed for.

The rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

September 02, 2019

pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No