

:1:

2024:PHHC:147060



108

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

CRA-S-926-2023(O&M)

Date of decision:12.11.2024

TANISH AND OTHERS

...Appellants

VERSUS

UDAI SINGH MEENA, IPS AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Appellant No.5-Satyavir Singh Badgujar in person.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Deputy A.G., Haryana.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

After going through the entire file, it transpires that the appellant No.5-Satyavir Singh Badgujar was earlier provided security by the Haryana police as the appellant was complainant in FIR No.233 dated 15.04.2022 registered under Section 506 of IPC, Section 75 of J.J. Act and Section 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act at Police Station Shivaji Colony, Rohtak and the other party was extending threats to him and he approached the Court concerned under Haryana Witness Protection Scheme, 2020. Subsequently, during investigation no substance was found in the allegations recorded in aforesaid FIR and finally police prepared and presented cancellation report in the Court concerned. On account of submission of cancellation report, the security which was earlier given to the appellant was withdrawn by the competent authority. Being aggrieved, the appellant moved an application before the Special Judge, Rohtak with request to provide him police protection. However,



the said application was declined by the said Court vide order dated 02.01.2023. Being aggrieved, the appellant has filed the present appeal under Section 14-A of SC/ST Act.

2. Appellant who has appeared in person submits that even now the accused persons are extending threats to cause physical harm to him and he be provided proper security to safeguard his life and liberty.

3. Reply by way of an affidavit of Mahesh Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rohtak filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from Inspector Dilbagh Singh submits that it appears that the appellant is seeking security guards just as a status symbol and there is no threat to the appellant from the side of any person. The State counsel further submits that otherwise also the competent authority will assess the threat perception if any is there and do the needful in accordance with law.

5. In light of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby disposed of with direction to Superintendent of Police, Rohtak to look into the matter and to assess the threat perception if any and to take necessary steps in accordance with law, in case, certain threat perception is found in the present case.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

12.11.2024
Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No