



CRWP-2420-2022

-1-

224 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-2420-2022

Date of decision: 21.11.2024

KULDIP RAI

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Ankur Ghai, Advocate (through video conferencing)
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing respondent No.2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of private respondent Nos.5 to 9.

2. Notice of motion was issued on 17.03.2022 and State was directed to file the status report, which has already been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is a senior citizen, who has filed a complaint before respondent No.2 but no action has been taken thereon till date.

4. Learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the status report filed by him and has submitted that the enquiry on the complaint filed by the petitioner was entrusted to ASI Paramjit Singh, who conducted the same exhaustively. He has submitted that as per the enquiry conducted, the crux dispute between the parties is of civil in nature and two civil suits are already

pending adjudication. He has submitted that threat perception was also assessed



CRWP-2420-2022

-2-

in respect of the petitioner but the same was also found to be false and thus, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has opposed the same and has submitted that the petitioner has threat to his life and liberty from respondents No.6 to 9.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record. It is deciphered from the facts and circumstances of the present case that enquiry on the complaint of the petitioner was carried out. Though, it has been mentioned that two civil suits are already pending adjudication between the parties and the threat perception was also not found to be genuine, however, the Court cannot ignore the fact that the dispute regarding the property is already pending adjudication. The respondent-State is directed to ensure that no harm to the life and liberty of the petitioner takes place. The petitioner would be at liberty to approach the appropriate authority in case any further cause of action accrues to him.

7. Disposed of.

21.11.2024

renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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