

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

112

**CRWP No.922 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 29.01.2020**

Sanjeev Kumar @ Neeta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Jasdeep Singh Walia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

In this petition, petitioner has prayed for issuance of necessary directions to the official respondents to protect his life and personal liberty from being invaded by the private respondents.

In this petition, grievance of the petitioner is that he is running a medical shop in the name and style of Happy Medical Hall at village Ghudda since year 2000. Respondents No.6 to 9 are the members of some club, the nomenclature of which is not known to the petitioner. At the instance of respondents No.6 to 9 number of raids were conducted at the medical hall of the petitioner but nothing incriminating was found by the raiding team. The private respondents have been making unfounded

complaints against the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is involved in selling some contraband at undisclosed place.

In this manner, the private respondents used to harass the petitioner regularly. Precisely, for grievance of the petitioner, the petitioner has moved number of representations to respondents No.2 and 3 but no action has been taken so far.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents, petitioner has prayed for necessary directions for safeguarding his personal civil and legal rights.

In the aforesaid context, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 31.08.2019 (Annexure P-1) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 5.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 5.

Respondent No.2 can be asked to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioners in order to ascertain veracity of allegations made by the petitioners.

Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioner or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. In case respondent No.2 finds that there is some truth in the allegations of the petitioner, then he/she shall proceed

to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the merits of the case. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any observation made by the Court in terms of pleadings at this stage. This order shall not debar the official respondents from proceeding against any of the party in accordance with law in case they are involved in some other case. It would be appreciated if the representation filed by the petitioner is decided within a period of one month from today keeping in view the threat perception shown by the petitioner.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

29.01.2020

geeta

**(Raj Mohan Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No