

[126] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCF No.1122 of 2022

Date of Decision : 05.09.2022

Jagmal Singh

...Petitioner

versus

Rajesh Kumar, Superintendent of Police,
Rewari, District Rewari, Haryana.

....Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 11.02.2022, in CRWP No.1253 of 2022 in case titled as '**Jagmal Singh** versus **State of Haryana and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), reveals that CRWP No.1253 of 2022 was disposed of by directing the respondent to go into the grievance of the petitioner within one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and to ensure that in the meanwhile the life and liberty of the petitioner was duly protected.

[3] Learned DAG, Haryana, had on the previous date produced copy of statement dated 20.03.2022 of the petitioner to the effect that he did not require any protection in view of his living separately from his family and that he would move an application in case he required any protection in future. However, the same was disputed as having been made by the petitioner.

[4] Case was adjourned to enable counsel for the petitioner to

seek instructions from the petitioner. On 24.08.2022, learned counsel on instructions from the petitioner stated that the petitioner had not made any statement on 20.03.2022 that he did not require protection and that he still had apprehension of harm. Thereupon, the learned DAG, Haryana, undertook to get a fresh assessment of threat perception to the petitioner made and to place the decision in respect thereto on record.

[5] In pursuance thereto, learned DAG, Haryana, has produced speaking order dated 29.08.2022 that on assessment, no threat of harm to the life and liberty of the petitioner was found and there was no need to provide any kind of personal protection / security cover to the petitioner at present but keeping in mind the claims of the petitioner, the SHO, Police Station Rohrai had been directed to ensure that as and when any apprehension was raised by the petitioner with regard to threat to life or liberty, prompt necessary action be taken on his representation / complaint and to provide him security if there was any threat to his life / liberty.

[6] Order dated 29.08.2022 is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who states that copy of the aforementioned order has already been received by the petitioner and that in the circumstances, he does not press the instant petition.

[7] In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

05.09.2022

'Rajneesh'