

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

CRM-M-41610-2019

Date of decision: February 06, 2020

Mohit Kumar Narang

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Nagra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Hemant Jain, Advocate
for respondents No.6, 9 and 11.

Mr. Sunil Garg, Advocate
for respondents No.7, 8, 10 and 12.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for issuance of direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life, liberty of the petitioner and provide security as the petitioner apprehends threat at the hands of respondents No. 6 to 12.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is running a shop, which he has taken on rent from respondents No.7 and 8 on 19.12.2007 and while executing the documents, some fraud was committed by respondents No.7 to 8 in the year 2007. It is further submitted that the petitioner has filed a civil suit against respondents No.7 and 8 for not to take the possession forcibly and stay has been granted by the Court, despite that the respondents are threatening the petitioner.

Reply by way of affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, (Central), Ludhiana filed today in the Court, wherein it is stated that the petitioner has given a representation dated 5.7.2019 on which enquiry was conducted by the Station House Officer, Police Station Division No.1, Ludhiana.

The petitioner initially started learning mobile repair work from Prince Kumar, who has, later on, gone abroad and petitioner continued to run his mobile shop. However, due to non-payment of rent of the said shop, a dispute arose between petitioner and respondent No.6 and on 9.7.2019, the petitioner fixed a permanent iron rod with welding on the shutter of the shop for which respondent No.6 moved an application and the Station House Officer recommended to register an FIR under Sections 447, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC. However, later on, the matter was compromised and the petitioner had taken away his articles from the shop in dispute. It is further submitted that the dispute is with regard to the tenancy/possession over the shop and there is no threat to the life of the petitioner.

In view of the same, no further action is called for and the petition stands disposed of.

February 06, 2020
satish

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No