

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

204-2

Decided on : 09.01.2023

1. CRWP-5954-2021

Sabhya Aggarwal and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

2. CRWP-6332-2021

Navneet Aggarwal

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Suvir Tandon, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Wadhawan Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gagandeep S. Virk, Advocate for respondent No. 6.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

By this order, I intend to dispose of CRWP-5954-2021, titled 'Sabhya Aggarwal and another v. State of Punjab and others' and CRWP-6332-2021, titled 'Navneet Aggarwal v. State of Punjab and others',.

In CRWP-5954-2021, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, prayer is for issuance of directions to respondents No. 1 to 5 to provide protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners, at the hands of private respondent No. 6. Perusal of the file reveals that vide order dated 01.07.2021, notice of motion was issued by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court for 16.09.2021.

In CRWP-6332-2021 filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India prayer is for issuance of directions to respondents No. 1 to 7 to

provide protection of lives and liberty to the petitioner, his daughter as well as business premises, at the hands of private respondent No. 8. In this petition also notice of motion was issued by the same Co-ordinate Bench on 13.07.2021 for 16.09.2021, and ordered to be heard along with CRWP No. 5954-2021.

After issuance of notice of motion, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner(s) in both petitions on five consecutive dates, i.e. 09.12.2021, 09.02.2022, 04.04.2022, 02.08.2022 and 18.10.2022.

Today, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) again seeks some time to argue the matter.

This Court finds no reason for granting any further opportunity to the petitioner(s) for arguing the matter, as from totality of circumstances recorded here above, it appears, either there is no merit in the averments mentioned in these petitions or the petitioner(s) are not interested in pursuing them.

Faced with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) in both petitions submits that he has got required instructions to withdraw both the petitions.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.01.2023

Riya

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