

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

CRM-M-54209-2021
Date of Decision : 23.12.2021

Vikram

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Ms. Molly A. Lakhanpal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (Oral.)

Fearing for life and liberty at the hands of the private respondents, the petitioner has come up before this Court seeking protection through the State, invoking the fundamental right of life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

Although the petitioner is seeking multiple prayers along with protection, but when asked to justify that how in one prayer different prayers can be joined, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present petition, she would be confining her prayer only for protection of life of the petitioner. Thus, given above, the present petition is confined to protection of life of the petitioner and other prayers are deleted with liberty preserved, as aforesaid.

Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given, the nature of the order this Court proposes to pass, there is no requirement to issue notices to the private respondents.

If the allegations of apprehension of threat to his life is found to be true, it might lead to an irreversible loss. Thus, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it shall be appropriate that the concerned Superintendent of Police/SHO or any officer to whom such powers have been delegated or has been authorized in this regard, grants protection to the petitioners for one week from today. However, if the petitioner no longer requires the protection, it may be discontinued even prior to the expiry of one week. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities upon the oral or written request of the petitioner.

This protection is subject to the stringent condition that from the time such protection is given, the petitioner shall not go outside the boundaries of the place of residence, except for medical necessities, to buy household necessities, and bereavements in the families of the close relatives or close friends. This restriction saves the petitioner from apprehended risk and ensures that the protection is not flaunted.

It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits. It shall also be open for the petitioner to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception. It is also clarified that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the petitioner's interrogation is required in any cognizable case.

The petition is disposed of in terms mentioned above.

December 23, 2021
AK

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/~~No~~
~~Yes~~/No