

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

CRWP-9752-2021

Date of decision-12.10.2021

Jarnail Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has filed this petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of directions to respondent No.2 to protect his life and liberty and his family members from respondent Nos.4 to 6. Further, it has been prayed that direction be issued to respondent No.2 for consideration of the representation dated 08.09.2021 (Annexure P-4) filed by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR No.130 dated 06.06.2021 registered under Section 435 IPC at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar, which was lodged on the statement of respondent No.6. He further submits that respondent No.4 had taken money from him with assurance that he would cancel the FIR, thereafter, wife of the petitioner moved representation (Annexure P-2) to Senior Superintendent of Police (Rural) Amritsar and enquiry was entrusted to

Station House Officer (respondent No.2). He further stated that respondent No.3 is demanding Rs.50, 000/- to cancel the FIR, but petitioner refused to give money, therefore, respondent Nos.5 threatened the petitioner that he will implicate him and his family members in false criminal case. He has invited the attention of the Court to the representations i.e Annexures P-2 to P-4 and submitted that no action has been taken so far by official respondents, therefore, necessary directions be issued.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court finds that the petition is founded on bald averments and is not supported by any convincing material. Apart from it, the averments in para 5 of the writ petition indicate that though the petitioner is in possession of video regarding demand and acceptance of bribe by respondent No.4, however, the same is not attached with the present petition.

Consequently, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 Constitution of India, as the petitioner can avail alternative remedy.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

12.10.2021

vanita

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