

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

**Sr.No.102**

**CRWP No.7847 of 2020**

Date of Decision: 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2020.

Gurmail Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Ors.

...Respondents

***(Heard through video-conferencing)***

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: Mr. K.B.Sharma, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Bhavna Gupta, DAG, Punjab.

**MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA (ORAL)**

By way of the instant petition, petitioner-Gurmail Singh has approached this Court seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.1 to 3 to protect his life and liberty as he apprehends threat to the same at the hands of respondents No.4 to 9 and he has further prayed for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to take appropriate action against respondents No.4 to 9. An alternative prayer for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to decide the representations Annexures P-1 and P-2, as moved by him (petitioner), has also been made.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Bhavna Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. She also submits that as per the instructions received by her in this matter, the representation annexed with the petition as P-1 has already been marked to

the Station House Officer, Police Station, Rama Mandi, Jalandhar, to look into the same.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that the petitioner moved another representation, i.e Annexure P-2, to respondent No.3 to seek redressal of his grievance pertaining to a separate incident and he restricts his prayer to issuance of a direction to respondent No.3 to take appropriate action on both the said representations, i.e. Annexure P-1 and P-2.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

Accordingly, without commenting upon the allegations and the grievances as set-forth in said Annexures P-1 and P-2, respondent No.3- Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar, is directed to look into both the representations (Annexures P-1 & P-2) of the petitioner expeditiously and if it is found that the petitioner genuinely deserves any protection, then to take appropriate action in accordance with law. It is clarified here that nothing contained in this order shall be construed to be a shield to the petitioner against any action already taken or intended to be taken by the competent Authority/person in respect of the matter as narrated in Annexures P-1 and P-2 and permissible under any relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE

30.09.2020.  
seema

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable?        | Yes/No |

