

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr.No.117

CRWP No.7552 of 2022

Date of Decision: 08th August, 2022.

Buta Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Mohit Singla, 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 made by the petitioner regarding taking legal action against the private respondents is concerned, the petitioner would avail 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 would be moving a fresh representation to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Moga, exclusively praying therein for the above-said protection only and he further prays that the said respondent be directed to look into and take appropriate action on the fresh representation of the petitioner within some specific time frame and the present petition may be disposed of accordingly.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, 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 respondent No.2 that in case, the petitioner moves any fresh 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, in the given set of the facts and circumstances of the matter, 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 the competent authority/person on account of the dispute between him and the private respondents and permissible under any relevant provisions of law.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

08.08.2022.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes
Whether Reportable?	No