

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRWP-9309-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-7.5.2022

Ruldu Ram	Versus	... Petitioner
State of Punjab and others		... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Raman Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Vinod Kumar Kaushal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking issuance of directions to official respondents to protect his life and liberty as he apprehends threat to the same at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.
2. Mr. Raman Kumar, Advocate for Mr. Vinod Kumar Kaushal, Advocate for the petitioner has requested for an adjournment on account of non-availability of the arguing counsel.
3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the reply filed on behalf of the State, wherein it has been deposed that the matter has been got inquired into and it has been found that it is basically a matter, wherein there is a civil litigation pending between the petitioner and the private respondents. It has further been informed that

during the course of inquiry, statement (Annexure R-1/T) of petitioner Ruldu Ram has been recorded, which reads as follows:

“Statement of Ruldu Ram son of Dass Mall resident of Village Gawalia, aged about 55 years, Police Station Dinanagar, District Gurdaspur.

Stated that I am resident of above said address and serving in FCI department as labour. The case is pending in the Lower Court Gurdaspur regarding dispute of his house in Panchayati land and I have filed a petition in the Hon’ble Punjab and Haryana High Court Chandigarh regarding dispute of panchayati land. I have not appear to the Police Officer for filed the complaint and nor filed in the local Police Station. I have filed a court case. In this regard, the court passed the any order, I agreed with. Statement heard and listen to be correct.

Sd/-
Ruldu Ram”

4. In view of the aforesaid statement and also in view of para No.3 of the reply, wherein it has been deposed that although no threat to the security of the petitioner or to other members of his family has been found but despite the same directions have been issued to SHO, Police Station Dinanagar to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and of other members of his family.
5. In view of the aforesaid position, the present petition is rendered infructuous and is disposed off as such.

7.5.2022
pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No