

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

**CRWP No.632 of 2020
Date of Decision: 20.01.2020**

Bahadur Ram

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Rituraj Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

[1]. Petitioner seeks issuance of direction to the respondents for protecting his life and liberty on the premise that earlier the petitioner was falsely implicated in case bearing FIR No.65 dated 08.07.2011 registered under Section 22 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Mahilpur, District Hoshiarpur, but the prosecution story was found to be baseless and the petitioner was acquitted by the Special Court at Hoshiarpur after trial. The aforesaid acquittal was recorded by the Court after noticing some incriminating facts.

[2]. Having failed to secure conviction of the petitioner, SI

Dilbagh Singh conducted the raid on the shop of the petitioner with an evil design to implicate him in a false case. On 02.10.2019, police party headed by the aforesaid SI Dilbagh Singh came to the shop of the petitioner. At that point of time, villagers immediately swung into action and intimated the superior police officers who reached the spot in time and during search of the vehicle of the aforesaid police officer SI Dilbagh Singh, the same was found to be loaded with narcotic. FIR No.0142 dated 03.10.2019 under Sections 15, 22 of the NDPS Act and Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act was registered at Police Station Mahilpur, District Hoshiarpura against SI Dilbagh Singh. The said incident was published in the newspaper and police officers were placed under suspension.

[3]. With this background, the petitioner feels reasonable apprehension of his false implication in some other case for which he has already moved an undated representation before the SSP, Hoshiarpur.

[4]. Notice of motion.

[5]. On the asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Ghuman, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State.

[6]. In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass, at this stage, there is no necessity of calling upon any response from the official respondents.

[7]. This petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to treat the present petition as representation of the petitioner and devise his ways and means to ascertain the truth and thereafter, act in accordance with law. If allegations of the petitioner are found to be of substance, then appropriate order in the context of his safety be also passed in accordance with law.

20.01.2020

Prince

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No