

115

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

CRWP-6685-2023

Date of Decision: 07.07.2023

Sandeep @ Armaan Malik and others

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Ms. Sapna Seth, Advocate for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to issue a writ in nature of mandamus for directing respondent Nos.2 & 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the private respondent Nos.4 & 5.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that a complaint/representation was given to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, SAS Nagar, Mohali, vide Annexure P-4 dated 30.06.2023, but no action has been taken by the police in this regard. She further submitted that earlier also one representation/complaint dated 19.06.2023 was given to the police authorities but the same could not be inadvertently attached with the present petition and she has supplied a copy of the same along with the receipt in this regard. She also submitted that the private respondents are constantly threatening the petitioners on YouTube but the police is not taking any action in this regard, therefore, she has prayed for protection of life and liberty of the petitioners.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners.
4. The grievance of the petitioners in the present case is that their life and liberty should be protected at the hands of the private respondents, who according to the learned counsel for the petitioners, are uploading various defaming videos in the YouTube and also instigating people to protest against the petitioners and to harm the petitioners.
5. However, a perusal of the petition as well as the representation/complaint to the police shows that there is no such specific incident which has been so mentioned in the complaint/representation. Although apprehension has been so expressed that through YouTube, the private respondents are instigating the people but the allegations made in the complaint/representation appear to be totally vague. In the absence of any real threat, no such petition can be entertained for seeking direction to the police.
6. In view of the above, this Court does not deem it fit and proper to interfere by invoking the provisions of Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.
7. However, the dismissal of the present petition would not disentitle the petitioners to file any complaint in future in case there is any real threat from the private respondents and that too in accordance with law to the concerned police station and in case any complaint is filed based upon some real threat then it is expected that the police shall take appropriate action strictly in accordance with law.

07.07.2023

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)

Bhumika

JUDGE

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