

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

232

CWP No.20711 of 2020
Date of Decision: 31.10.2023

Gurinder Pal Singh Grewal

..... **Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... **Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ranjeet K. Jaswal, Advocate, for
Mr. J.S. Sarao, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J (ORAL)

The petitioner by way of this petition has approached this Court for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to reinstate security police personnel of the petitioner which was wrongly and illegally withdrawn on 10.01.2020.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that father of the petitioner namely Sikander Singh was working in the Punjab Police as Deputy Superintendent of Police and during his life time and on 28.08.1971, his father was murdered by the group of Nexlites. In this regard, FIR No.129 dated 28.08.1971 under Sections 302, 307, 148 and 149 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act was registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala. Thereafter, the petitioner was appointed on compensatory ground as Inspector in the Punjab Police. On 28.02.2009, the petitioner retired from his service as Inspector General of Police and after the retirement, the petitioner is residing with his family at Patiala and he was

provided security and two gunman were assigned. On 10.01.2020 (Annexure P-2), the security personnel attached with the petitioner was withdrawn.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that no enquiry was done by the respondents in order to ascertain the threat perception of the life of the petitioner. Neither any prior intimation was sent to the petitioner for withdrawing his security personnel and after withdrawing the security personnel, the petitioner has moved the representation to respondents No.2 and 3 for restoration of his security cover but no action was taken with regard to the grievance made by the petitioner in his representation.

In pursuance to the notice of motion issued by this Court, respondents No.1 to 4 has filed their reply by way of affidavit of Sh. Paramdip Singh Sandhu, PPS, AIG, Security, Punjab. A specific stand is taken that the norms and guidelines for providing security to an individual protectees have been finalized by the Government of Punjab on 02.09.2013 in pursuance of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP No.25237 of 2010 titled 'Abhay Singh Vs. State of U.P. and others'.

Learned State counsel further refers to the latest appraisal of the threat perception of the petitioner and submits that on appraisal of the threat perception, no specific input indicating any present threat to security of the petitioner from any terrorist/militant/gangster outfits operating in the country is found. The petitioner has retired from the service in the year 2009 and as such, in view of the policy decision, he is not entitled to security cover.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and have perused the record of the case file.

After perusal of the case file and in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any ground to issue any directions to respondents No.1 to 4 to provide security cover to the petitioner specially in view of the latest appraisal of the threat perception by the concerned quarter.

In view of above, the present petition is dismissed.

However, liberty is granted to the petitioner in case, there is any specific input regarding any threat perception in future, he may approach the concerned quarter for seeking security.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

31.10.2023
D.Bansal

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No