

COCN No.1224 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 08.09.2022

Kawaljeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Ganga Ram Punia and others

....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Prabhdeep Singh Toor, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 29.03.2022, in CRWP No.2700 of 2021.

2. A perusal of order Annexure P/1 reveals that CRWP No.2700 of 2021 was disposed of by directing the competent authority to provide appropriate protection to the petitioner for one week from date of order but if the petitioner no longer required protection, then at his request, the same could be discontinued even before the expiry of said period of one week and thereafter the concerned officer was to extend the protection on analysis of threat perception on day to day basis on oral or written request of the petitioner.

3. Learned DAG, Haryana, refers to compliance report to contend that Incharge, Police Post Model Town, Karnal, had deputed police officials by way of Rider No.20 for the protection of the petitioner and they were

deployed at House No.46-L, Model Town, Karnal, but the petitioner was not at his house and the same was found locked, whereupon, on 01.04.2022, the Incharge telephonically tried to contact the petitioner on his mobile No.94169-50105, but the same was not reachable/out of range, in respect of which, DDE No.10 dated 01.04.2022, was got recorded by Dharam Pal, Incharge, Police Post, Model Town, Karnal i.e. Annexure R/1. Learned counsel further states that although protection in terms of order of this Court Annexure P/1 was provided to the petitioner from 01.04.2022 to **12.04.2022**, but the petitioner did not avail of the same and, thereafter also assessment was made by the competent authority but no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner was found, thereafter, the security deployed for protection of the petitioner was withdrawn. Learned counsel further contends that in case of any apprehension, the petitioner can move an application to the SHO concerned, who would consider the same and in case of threat and if the circumstances of the case so warranted, police protection provided to the petitioner at the earliest.

4. The same satisfies learned counsel for the petitioner, who states that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not press the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same.

5. 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 respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to the petitioner to move an application before the SHO concerned, in case of any apprehension of threat to his life

and liberty. In case any representation is received the SHO concerned is

directed to consider and decide the same on receipt, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible and provide protection to the petitioner, if the circumstances of the case so warrant.

6. Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

08.09.2022
manju

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