

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

CWP No.20662 of 2019

Date of Decision : 30.09.2019

Kapil Mahajan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present : None for the petitioner.

Ms.Ambika Sood, DAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

Challenge in the instant petition is to the order dated 11.07.2019 (Annexure P-8) and in terms of which the police security cover that had been provided to the petitioner was ordered to be withdrawn.

On a previous date of hearing i.e. 06.09.2019 learned State counsel had been directed to bring forth the basis as also review of the threat perception and in pursuance to which the impugned order dated 11.07.2019 (Annexure P-8) had been passed.

A short reply by way of affidavit of AIG,Security, Punjab has been placed on record. Para 6 of the affidavit reads as follows :

“6. That in the case of the instant petitioner, it is humbly submitted that an assessment of threat perception was carried out by the office of respondent No.3. As per the established procedure, threat perception reports were obtained from the Intelligence Wing and the local police.

An objective assessment of these reports revealed that there are no specific threat inputs indicating any threat to the security of the petitioner, from any terrorist/militant outfit operating in the country. Therefore, it was decided that security cover to the petitioner at state expenditure was not warranted to be retained in the instant case.”

As per stand taken in the written statement, an assessment of the threat perception as regards the petitioner has been carried out by the office of the Additional D.G.P.(Security), Punjab and it is only thereafter that the impugned order has been passed and the security cover withdrawn.

There would be no basis for this court to take a different view in the matter.

It may further be noticed that on the previous date of hearing i.e. 27.09.2019 proxy counsel Mr.Nitin Sharma, Advocate had appeared and it had been made clear to him that if on the adjourned date i.e. today Mr.C.K.Mahajan, Advocate does not appear, the petition would stand dismissed.

No infirmity is found in the impugned order dated 11.07.2019 (Annexure P-8).

Writ petition dismissed.

30.09.2019
dss

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No