

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

133

CRWP-4131-2022

Date of Decision: 04.05.2022

KARAMJIT SINGH BHULLAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Jaswinder Singh Thind, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karanbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

Instant petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus for directing the official respondents No.4 and 5 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and the member of his family from the hands of respondents No.6 to 9.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been working as Assistant Jail Superintendent, Ferozepur since 2009 and during his tenure he filed a number of complaints to the official respondents against the persons who were involved in the trade of supplying intoxicant drugs to the jail inmates. On account of the petitioner having initiated the steps, as many as 241 cases were found to have indulged in the trade of intoxicant activities in the jail premises.

Learned counsel has contended that the petitioner apprehends threat to his life and that to the members of his family as respondents no.6 and 7 were formerly the Superintendents of Jail and retired as DIG Prisons. It is contended that in a proximate event that took place on 24.04.2022, some persons had knocked at his home and enquired about the whereabouts of the petitioner and that his family has a grave apprehension of physical damage being caused to him and his family members.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition.

Even though the petitioner was a whistle blower and had initiated complaints and actions against the persons involved in the intoxicant trade within the jail premises, resulting in discovering 241 cases of such trade, however, the said incident took place in the year 2009. The private respondents No.6 and 7 have since been superannuated, there is nothing on record to infer that the said respondents, even while being posted as the Superiors had extended any threat to the petitioner. Moreover, any apprehension which is not supported by any cogent material and is merely based upon a perception cannot be made the basis of issuing of any such direction to the police officials.

The present petition is thus without any merit and the same is accordingly, dismissed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

04.05.2022
rajender

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