

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No. 106

CRM-M-21418-2020

Date of decision : 04.08.2020

Pardeep Duhan

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr.Rajeev Sharma (Raju), Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Amit Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Case taken up through video conferencing.

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for the issuance of a direction to provide security to the petitioner, a Sarpanch of village Shaharmalpur, District Panipat, as according to him he is under continuous threat to his life and property from gangsters/hard core criminals.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the petitioner had been provided security cover by the respondent-State which was withdrawn in the year 2019 and against such withdrawal of security the petitioner had filed a petition before this Court being *CRM-M-17233-2019 "Pardeep Duhan vs State of Haryana and others"* which was disposed of on 08.08.2019. The operative part of such order reads as under: -

“A perusal of the representation (Annexure P-2) show that it is alleged that a history-sheeter/hardcore criminal Rajesh son of Mahender, against whom number of cases of heinous crimes are pending, has threatened the petitioner. It is further stated that the Inspector General of Police, Karnal had provided a gunman to the petitioner, which was however withdrawn later on.

Considering the allegations raised in the representation (Annexure P-2), this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to re-access the threat perception to the petitioner as per the policy instructions of the government and if so required, do the needful for providing the protection to the petitioner. The representation (Annexure P-2) dated 15.02.2019 shall also be decided by respondent No.2 expeditiously preferably within a period of 02 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this

order.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the afore quoted order, the Superintendent of Police, Panipat, through his order dated 04.09.2019, provided security cover to the petitioner for six months which has now been withdrawn and against such withdrawal of security the petitioner has filed a representation dated 09.07.2020 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.3 which remains undecided.

In the aforesaid representation dated 09.07.2020 the petitioner, who had earlier been given security cover, alleges that threat to his life and property continues even after withdrawal of his security cover. That being so, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3- Superintendent of Police, Panipat to consider the afore-referred representation of the petitioner dated 09.07.2020 (Annexure P-4); to assess the threat perception to the petitioner and then take action as is deemed fit by him in accordance with law. The needful be done forthwith.

04.08.2020

shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No