

112

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-2016-2021

Date of Decision: 22.04.2021

**Rohit Kumar @ Akshit Kumar Manchanda
@ Karan Arora**

.. Petitioner

Vs.

Union Territory Chandigarh and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Divya Gulati, Advocate for
Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, A.P.P., U.T. Chandigarh.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

This criminal writ petition has been filed under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of appropriate directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner from the hands of respondent No.4 and his goons and to take legal action against him. Further prayer has been made to decide his representation (Annexure P-5).

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner, who is also known as Rohit Kumar son of Jeet Lal has already filed a suit against respondent No.4 on the ground that he is the biological father of the petitioner and the same is pending before the Civil Court, Amloh. It is the case of the petitioner that he was given in adoption to Jeet Lal son of Ganga Ram and the said adoption was not in accordance with law, therefore, he has filed the suit seeking injunction against respondent No.4 to restrain him from alienating the property. Learned counsel has pointed out that despite the

representation (Annexure P-5) given to the SSP, Chandigarh, no action has been taken upon the same, therefore, he has approached this Court and prays for issuance of necessary directions.

After hearing the learned counsel, this Court is of the considered opinion that the prayer made by the petitioner in this petition is based on disputed facts and his claim that respondent No.4 is his biological father is yet to be proved, as suit filed by him in this regard is pending adjudication. The prayer of the petitioner for providing him protection is also not worth acceptance, as the representation does not contain the relevant particulars regarding the alleged threat. The representation simply contains the bald averments and is not supported by any convincing material, therefore, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercising of extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

22.04.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes	No
Yes	No