

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

CRM-M-28390-2020

Date of decision-17.09.2020

Navneet Gopi

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Vaneet Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Navneet Gopi has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.1 to 4 for conducting an inquiry in his representations/complaints (Annexures P-3 and P-4) and further to take legal action against respondent No.5, namely, Kangana Ranaut, who has outraged the religious feelings of the petitioner and others by intentionally putting a post on social media to promote consumption of beef. Further, it is prayed that the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family be protected, who are facing threats as a result of complaints given by him against respondent No.5.

Learned counsel contends that respondent No.5 is a renowned actor, who has acted in various Hindi films and therefore, she has large number of fans who follow her everyday, at least on the social media. He has invited the attention of the Court to the subject posts (Annexures P-1 and P-2) allegedly put on social media by respondent No.5 and submits that these contents have hurt the religious feelings of particular section of society which amounts to commission of offence punishable under penal laws. It is pointed out that the petitioner gave two representations in this regard on

of Police, Ludhiana, respectively, for registration of FIR against respondent No.5 under Section 8 of Punjab Prohibition of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955, Sections 66 and 67 of Information Technology Act, 2000 and Section 295-A Indian Penal Code, 1860, but no action has been taken on these complaints so far by the official respondents. Learned counsel has further made a prayer for issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family as certain unscrupulous persons and organizations are giving threats to them because of the complaints given by him against respondent No.5. He prays that the necessary directions be issued to the official respondents.

After hearing the learned counsel and going through the averments in the petition, this Court does not find any merit in the prayer made by the petitioner. A perusal of the alleged post (Annexure P-1) does not *prima facie* suggest that it amounts to commission of an offence punishable under Section 295-A IPC, in any manner. On the contrary, the post describes the person as vegetarian, therefore, it cannot be construed at all, that it promotes consumption of beef much less by way of an advice. The other post (Annexure P-2) relied upon by the petitioner contains excerpts of conversation about eating places within and outside India and most importantly, it nowhere shows that it was posted on social media by respondent No.5. Thus, the facts and circumstances do not indicate commission of any cognizable offence by respondent No.5

The other prayer of the petitioner for protecting his life and liberty is also not based upon any genuine apprehension of threat as no details of the persons or organizations, from whom the alleged threat is being received has been mentioned in the petition. Apart from it, the

particulars as no averment regarding threat to the petitioner or his family has been pleaded. It has not at all been described as to how and in what manner the alleged threat was extended to him.

In view of the above discussion, this Court has no hesitation in holding that the petition is vague and misconceived, therefore, this Court is not inclined to exercise the inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

Resultantly, petition fails and is dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

17.09.2020
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No