

115 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3808-2023

Date of decision: 26.04.2023

Sanjit Singh Gill

.....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Vaibha Sehgal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuing directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to protect the life and personal liberty of the petitioner and for issuance of directions to respondent No. 2- to take action on the representation dated 12.04.2023 (Annexure P-6) in accordance with law.

Today, status report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Gursharanjit Singh, PPS, Superintendent of Police (City), Moga, District Moga has been filed by State, which is taken on record.

Vide order dated 21.04.2023, learned State counsel sought time to complete his instructions. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Varinder Kumar submits that after receiving the application presented by the petitioner, the threat perception was assessed and thereafter, on the basis of the said threat assessment, four armed police personnel were deployed with the petitioner, who were performing their

duties honestly without any influence. He further submits that the State is duty bound to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner being the citizen of the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a reputed businessman of Moga, who received threats to his life and liberty from the extortionist. The petitioner reported the entire issue to the police authorities whereafter, assessing the threat perception the police personnels were deployed with the petitioner and the FIR No.68 dated 11.04.2023 duly registered under Sections 387, 506 of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station City South, Moga District Moga. Learned counsel further submits that though the petitioner was provided security but being not satisfied with the conduct and working of the said security personnel, representation dated 12.04.2023 was submitted before the respondent No.2 but no action was taken in pursuance to the said representation, where it was alleged that the purpose for providing police security was not fulfilled as the weapons carried by the said security personnels were of the inferior quality and were not in the proper condition and in any such unfortunate eventuality with such weapons the life and personal liberty of the petitioner as well as to his family members would always be at risk.

Learned counsel for the petitioner prays that after receiving the reply where the State has assured for protecting life and liberty of the petitioner be directed that in case the security provided to the petitioner in any circumstances is to be withdrawn then prior notice to such

withdrawal be issued to the petitioner so that he may move an application for extension of the security cover before the appropriate authority.

Prayer is allowed.

Respondents are directed to issue a notice in case after assessing his threat perception, there is necessity for withdrawal of his security cover as provided by the police authorities.

In view of the above, nothing remains to be adjudicated and the present petition is accordingly disposed of.

26.04.2023	(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
Sapna	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No