

CRWP No.7527 of 2023

2023:PHHC:097321

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

CRWP No.7527 of 2023

Date of Decision: 31.07.2023

Vineet Goswami

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Ranjeet Singh Chauhan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

The petitioner who claims to be a practicing advocate, has come up before this Court seeking protection because he is apprehending threats at the hands of corrupt government employee whose acts he wanted to expose without any personal advantage.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be confining his prayer to the extent of protection of life and liberty of the petitioner at this stage, reserving his right to take other legal remedies for remaining prayers including filing of fresh writ petition.

3. Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order that this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondents nor the issuance of notices to the private respondents is required.

4. Counsel for the State submits that whether exposure of the deeds was in public interest or personal advantage is yet to be seen.

5. Be that as it may, if the allegations of apprehension of threat to life turn out to be true, it might lead to an irreversible loss. Thus, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it shall be appropriate that the concerned Superintendent of Police, SHO, or any officer to whom such powers have been delegated or have been authorized in this regard, provide appropriate protection to the petitioner for one week from today. **The protection is restricted to four walls of his house and only upto the gate of the Court where the petitioner has to go for attending the hearing.** However, if the petitioner no

before the expiry of one week. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities or upon the oral or written request of the petitioner.

6. It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits and that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation of the petitioner is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for the petitioner to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

7. The concerned Commissioner of Police to also inquire into the matter to know whether the allegations made in the petition against the government employee(s), are genuine or with a view to extort money from such employee and proceed further in accordance with law.

8. **This order shall eclipse after fifteen days from today.**

9. Liberty reserved to the petitioner to file a fresh representation to the concerned Commissioner of Police within fifteen days from today. If the petitioner files such representation within the above mentioned time period of fifteen days, then the same shall be decided by the concerned Commissioner of Police within two months.

10. It is clarified that the petitioner shall not seek protection in the said representation and in case, he feels threat perception, he will file separate petition for protection.

11. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order, and any Advocate for the Petitioners and State can download this order and other relevant particulars from the official web page of this court and attest it to be a true copy. The concerned officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for immediate use.*

**Petition is allowed to the extent mentioned above.** All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

31.07.2023  
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.