

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(122)

CRWP No. 10697 of 2021

Date of Decision : 12.11.2021

Harjeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Lakhwinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.
(keeping in view advance copy given)

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed alleging threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of private respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner is receiving threat to his life and liberty at the hands of the private respondents as there is a criminal case wherein both the petitioner and the private respondents have been arrayed as accused persons and petitioner is being blamed by the private respondents to be the reason behind registration of the said case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the threat perception being faced by the petitioner is that in case the petitioner enters the premises where the criminal proceedings are being undertaken in District Rohtak, the petitioner will have to face dire consequences related to

his life and liberty. Learned counsel further submits that the said threat perception has already been brought to the notice of the Superintendent of Police, Rohtak by filing representation dated 02.08.2021 (Annexure P-2) and the said representation is still pending consideration with the said authorities. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner will be satisfied, at this stage, in case a direction is issued to respondent No. 4 to decide the representation dated 02.08.2021 (Annexure P-2) in a time bound manner by passing an appropriate speaking order.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in Court, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Learned State counsel raises no objection in deciding the representation dated 02.08.2021 (Annexure P-2) in a time bound manner by passing an appropriate speaking order.

In view of the request made, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or the claim being made by the petitioner, respondent No. 4 i.e. Superintendent of Police Rohtak, District Rohtak, is directed to decide the representation dated 02.08.2021 (Annexure P-2) by passing a speaking order within a period of eight weeks from the receipt of copy of this order.

Present petition stands disposed of.

November 11, 2021

kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No

Whether reportable? Yes/No