

245 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3411-2023
Date of Decision: 19.09.2023

Hans Raj Hans

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S. SHEKHAWAT

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Proxy counsel for

Mr. Rana Gurtej Singh, Advocate for respondent No.5.

N.S. SHEKHAWAT, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to issue appropriate direction to respondents No.2 & 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members.

2. It has been pleaded in the present petition that Aryan Hans, son of the petitioner was murdered by accused Prartham Sharma@Pathi and others and the petitioner had lodged FIR No.184 dated 12.11.2021 under Sections 302, 392, 201 of IPC, Police Station Sadar, Hoshiarpur District Hoshiarpur against the accused. In fact, the close associates of Rajan Sahini had threatened the petitioner to compromise the matter and the petitioner was pressurized not to testify before the trial Court. Even the official respondents did not take action against the named accused, on the basis of the representation submitted by the petitioner. Consequently, it was pleaded that the petitioner apprehended imminent threat to his life.

3. A short reply by way of affidavit of Palwinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division City Hoshiarpur, on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 has been filed in Court.

4. Learned State counsel submits that Superintendent of Police (Investigation), Hoshiarpur was directed to conduct an inquiry on the representation submitted by the petitioner. After the submission of report, the threat assessment of the petitioner was conducted and adequate areas security, PCR in the area was ordered to be deployed. Still further, SHO, Police Station, City Hoshiarpur was directed to provide the personal number of the SHO along with numbers of the Police Station, City Hoshiarpur, PCR and Control Room so that the petitioner may contact the said numbers in case of any threat to him. Apart from that, further to ensure that no untoward incident takes place at the time of the trial, even one PSO has been provided to the petitioner on each and every date of hearing, even though, there was no threat to the security of the present petitioner. He further contends that one FIR No.31 dated 30.01.2001 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 306, 326 IPC, Police Station Sadar Hoshiarpur has also been registered against the present petitioner.

5. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, nothing survives in the present petition and is accordingly ordered to be disposed of.

19.09.2023

Deepak Patwal

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE**

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