

CRWP No. 1423 of 2022

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

CRWP No.1423 of 2022

Date of Decision: 17.02.2022

Shakuntla and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harsimar Singh Sitta, AAG, Punjab.

(Through Video Conferencing)

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

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

Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order that this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondents nor the issuance of notices to the private respondents is required.

If the allegations of apprehension of threat to life turn out 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 have been authorized in this regard, provide appropriate protection to the petitioner for one week from today. However, if the petitioner no longer requires the protection, then at their request, it may be discontinued even before the expiry of one week. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities or 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 for bereavements in

CRWP No. 1423 of 2022

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.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that second petitioner is working in a private firm. Given above, he would be permitted to leave for his work but no PSO will be given while going and coming from the work place. In case of apprehension of threat, the petitioner may apprise his employer, take leave.

It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits and 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 interrogation of the petitioner is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for the petitioner to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

There would be no need for a certified copy of this order, and any Advocate for the Petitioner and State can download this order and other particulars as may be required from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. The concerned officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

Petition is allowed to the extent mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

17.02. 2022
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: **No.**