

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

**Sr.No.116**

**CRWP No.7544 of 2022**

**Date of Decision: 08<sup>th</sup> August, 2022.**

Jagjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: Mr. Jitender K. Sehrawat, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\* \* \* \*

**MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)**

After arguing for a while, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that so far as the prayer of the petitioner regarding taking legal action against respondents No.4 to 6 is concerned, he (petitioner) would be resorting to the appropriate, alternative and efficacious remedy, as may be permissible to him under law, for this purpose and as regards his prayer qua the protection of his life and liberty, he (petitioner) would move a representation to the Superintendent of Police, Hisar, exclusively praying therein for the said protection only and he further prays that the said Authority be directed to look into and take appropriate action on the representation of the petitioner within some specific time frame and this petition may be disposed of accordingly.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, who has appeared on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case in pursuance of the copies of the present petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance, has no objection to the above-discussed

submission as well as the prayer as made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Resultantly, the petition in hand stands disposed of with a direction to the Superintendent of Police, Hisar that in case, the petitioner moves any representation to him restricting his prayer therein to the protection of his life and liberty only, he shall look into the same and if the petitioner would be found to be genuinely deserving the said protection, then he shall take appropriate action strictly in accordance with law, preferably within a period of ten (10) days.

It is further clarified that this order shall not be construed to be a shield to the petitioner against any action/proceedings already initiated or intended/contemplated to be initiated against him by any competent authority/person on account of the facts and circumstances of the present matter and permissible under the relevant provisions of law.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE

08.08.2022.  
seema

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes |
| Whether Reportable?        | No  |