

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104

CRWP-3807-2023

Decided on : 22.05.2023

Govind Kumar and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kuldeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.
Assisted by ASI Sukhdev Singh.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present protection petition, after hearing the counsel for the petitioners on 24.04.2023, following order was passed:

“1. Petitioner No.1-Govind Kumar, aged 23 years and Petitioner No.2-Pooja Yadav, aged 21 years have approached this Court for seeking directions for protection of their lives and liberty, which is at the imminent danger at the hands of respondents No.4 & 5.

2. Counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners are residing in Village Chanaloh, Tehsil Kurali, District Mohali for the last about 5 to 6 years and respondents No.4 & 5 are also residing in same village, who are family members of petitioner No.2-Pooja Yadav.

3. It is noticed by the Court that in Paragraph No.2, petitioners have themselves stated to be permanent residents of Uttar Pradesh and at present, petitioner No.1-Govind Kumar is working at Morinda in private factory. Despite granting opportunity, no evidence in regard to the fact that petitioner No.1 is working at Morinda in a private factory or is resident of the address shown in the petition i.e. within the State of Punjab, is submitted.

4. Counsel for the petitioners further relies upon the rent agreement (undated), copy of which has been appended with the petition, and purported to have been executed between petitioner No.1 being tenant and one Ramesh Yadav and the period of the tenancy has been stated as 20.12.2022 to 01.11.2023.

5. Learned State counsel would get it verified from respondent No.3-Station House Officer, Police Station Kurali, District Mohali, whether the contentions submitted before this Court are true or not?

6. Adjourned to 22.05.2023.”

2. Today, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Sukhdev Singh states that respondents No.4 & 5 are residents in the State of Uttar Pradesh and whereabouts of petitioners are not known as they are on run.
3. Counsel for the petitioners is also unable to produce any evidence in regard to the residence of the petitioners.
4. Faced with the situation, counsel for the petitioners seeks withdrawal of the present petition.
5. Dismissed as withdrawn.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

May 22, 2023

k.nain

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No