

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

**CRWP No. 10749 of 2021
Decided on: 3rd March, 2022**

Inderjit Singh and others

Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. HPS Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Amit Mehta, Senior DAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.

This petition was filed seeking directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of the private respondents, arrayed as respondents No. 7 and 8.

As per the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioners there is a drafting error in the petition. There was a deed for sale of land between the petitioner and respondent No. 7 through respondent No. 8 (property dealer). There was dispute with regard to execution of the sale deed. A legal notice was served. The allegations are that respondents No. 6 and 7 are officials of Punjab police and there is a threat perception to the petitioners.

The State filed a short reply by way of affidavit of Rajesh Kumar Chibber, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Circle Nabha, District Patiala. As per the reply filed, petitioner No. 1-Inderjit Singh got

recorded his statement reiterating threat perception from Bahadur Singh. It is pleaded that after examining the matter, as a preventive measure Sections 107 and 150 Cr.P.C. against Bahadur Singh and the complainant were invoked and report was sent to Divisional Magistrate, Nabha on 9.2.2022. Paragraph 12 of the reply is quoted below:

“That now, there is no perception of threat to life and liberty of petitioners, even then police help numbers are provided that if at any stage they feel any threat to their life and liberty they can contact on such numbers, so that protection can be provided immediately to them.”

Apart from the bald statement of petitioner No.1 that there is a threat perception, nothing more is forth coming to contradict the pleadings of paragraph 12 of the reply. Learned counsel for the State on instructions submits that in case of any threat perception, the petitioners can move the authorities and the request would be considered expeditiously in accordance with law.

In view of the above noted facts, no further directions are called for.

The petition is disposed of.

Needless to say that the petitioners would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law for redressal of the surviving grievances, if any.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

3rd March, 2022

mk

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No