

CRWP-11093 of 2021

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

(Proceedings through V.C.)

CRWP-11093 of 2021
Date of Decision: 24.11.2021

Mangat Masih

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present: - Mr. Rahul Kumar Adia, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. C.L. Pawar. Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 and 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner from danger at the hands of respondents No.5 to 12.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that private respondents used to tease 17½ years old daughter of the petitioner to which he objected and stopped the respondents from doing so. On 16.10.2021 respondents attacked the petitioner. The petitioner got admitted in the hospital and the incident was reported to the police on the same date. Due to the threats given by the private respondents, petitioner had to get discharged from the hospital on 01.11.2021. Due to fear of the private respondents, now petitioner is living at the house of his relative.

In this regard representation dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-5) was given

CRWP-11093 of 2021

to the police to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members but no action has been taken thereon so far.

Heard.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court finds that the petition contains bald averments regarding apprehension of threat allegedly faced by the petitioner, as the same is not supported with any convincing material. The representation dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioner, simply contains the averment regarding danger to his life, also lacks material particulars as it does not at all reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioner. If petitioner has been assaulted or given injuries, he can avail remedies in accordance with law.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

November 24, 2021
R.S.

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

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