

**236 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRWP-749 of 2020

Date of Decision : April 04, 2022

Dharampal Raheja

..... Petitioner

vs

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

Present : Mr. Imran Ali, Advocate for
Mr. Mansur Ali, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Bhavna Gupta, DAG, Punjab.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (Oral)

1. In the instant petition, a mandamus is strived to be made upon the official respondents concerned, to ensure that the alleged life endangering threats, rather emanating from the private respondents concerned, are warded off, though adequate police security being granted to the petitioner.

2. However, the petitioner is instantly in a foreign land, and, also it is evident, from a reading of paragraph 4 of the reply on affidavit furnished to the petition on behalf of co-respondents no.1 and 3, that the present petitioner, is not required to be associated in any criminal case rather his son one Sunil Kumar is an accused in FIR No.122 of 2002, registered at Police Station Divisioin No.6, Ludhiana.

3. Though the petitioner is residing in U.S.A., and, though he claims that life endangering threats rather emanating from the private respondents concerned, hence would be warded off, only upon adequate police protection be granted to him by the official respondents, and, though

there is no tangible material in respect of potentiality of the aforemade threats, and, nor qua theirs becoming fructified. However, in the reply filed to the petition on behalf of co-respondents no.2 and 3, yet still as a precautionary measure(s), to, ward off the threats concerned, and, as may emanate, from the private respondents, especially in the relevant portion of paragraph 4 of the reply, on affidavit, rather a communication occurs, that the S.H.O. of the police station concerned, and, the PCRs squad of the area concerned both have been directed to keep a strict surveillance, and, that in case there is any life endangering threat emanating from the private respondents concerned, thereupon he has been given the mobile numbers of the officials concerned, for his making contacts with them for the relevant purpose.

4. Consequently, the above referred portion of the reply, on affidavit furnished to the petition by the co-respondents no.4 does completely, redress the above espoused prayer in the instant petition.

5. In view of the above, nothing survives in the petition, and, it is disposed of. It is expected from the official respondents concerned, to abide with the above relevant portion of the reply on affidavit furnished to the petition.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

April 04, 2022
sarita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No