

2024:PHHC:065325



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

251

CRWP-3457-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.05.2024

Mohammad Qasim and another Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Ms. Kusum Raj, Advocate for
Mr. Khalid, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Reply by way of affidavit of Ajiab Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, HQ, Nuh has been filed. The same is taken on record.
2. Petitioners approached this Court seeking protection of life and liberty claiming that they are living in relation. The stand of the State reads as under:-

“xx xx xx

3. That in this regard it is respectfully submitted that after receiving the notice of the present petition, an enquiry has been conducted by the local police and the petitioners no 1-2 and private respondents no. 4-7 are joined in the enquiry proceedings and during the course of enquiry, the petitioner have made

2024:PHHC:065325




statements. It is also pertinent to mention here that they have categorically contended in their statements, that they have no apprehending danger from the private respondents. The petitioner no 2 has categorically stated in her statement that she is living in relation with petitioner no i happily and she has no apprehending danger from the private respondents. The statements of petitioner nos. 1 & 2 are annexed as Annexure R-1 &R-2.

4. That during the course of enquiry, the private respondents were also joined in the enquiry proceedings, the statements of private respondent no.4-7 were recorded, which are annexed as Annexure R-3 to R-6. The enquiry report conducted by the local police is annexed as annexure R-7. However, respondent nos.8 &. 9 did not appear before the enquiry officer in spite of serious efforts made by the local police.

5. That it is also pertinent to mention here that the petitioners have never appeared before the local police to take police protection However, they are at liberty to take police protection as and when required them and they can stay in safe house at Nuh.”

3. Apart from that counsel for the State relies upon statement of the petitioners recorded during the course of enquiry. Both of them claimed that they are residing in Chennai happily and don't need any police protection.

4. Counsel for the petitioners expressed her satisfaction upon the same.



- 5. In view of above, no further order is warranted.
- 6. Petition stands disposed off.
- 7. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

07.05.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No