

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

280

CWP-24958-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.11.2023

Harmeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Teevar Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is to direct the respondents to provide security cover to the petitioner in the light of the imminent threat faced by him on account of being a three times legislature from Tarn Taran Assembly Constituency, and also due to serious security threat perception to all public figures due to increase of terrorist activities in the area.

2. A short reply by way of affidavit of Paramdip Singh Sandhu, Assistant Inspector General of Police, Security, Punjab, Chandigarh dated 15.12.2021 had been filed. Para 9 thereof reads thus :

“9. That an objective assessment and appraisal of latest threat perception reports received from the concerned quarters has revealed that at present there is no input indicating any specific threat to security of the petitioner from any terrorist/ militant / gangster outfit operating in the country.”

3. Thereafter, a detailed reply by way of affidavit of Varinder Paul Singh, Assistant Inspector General of Police, Security, Punjab, Chandigarh dated 05.05.2022 was also filed, wherein it is being averred as under :-

“9. That an objective assessment and appraisal of latest threat perception reports received from the concerned quarters has revealed that at present there is no intelligence input indicating any specific threat to security of the petitioner from any terrorist/ militant/ gangster outfit operating in the country. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Taran Tarn has further reported that the petitioner has not received any threat from any terrorist or separatist party or any others organization to his life. Therefore, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Taran Tarn has not recommended provide any security to Sh. Harmeet Singh Ex-MLA.”

4. The specific reply on behalf of the respondents has been to the effect that the threat perception has been assessed by the respondents and there is no intelligence / information indicating any specific security threat to the petitioner from any terrorist/ militant / gangster outfit operating in the country. Hence, there was no recommendation for providing any security to the petitioner.

5. The aforesaid written statement filed by the respondents has remained uncontroverted, even though a period of about two years has since been elapsed. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that the petitioner is no more interested in pursuing the present writ petition.

6. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

14.11.2023

Satyawan

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

2. Whether reportable: Yes/No