

**CRWP-5111-2024****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****116****CRWP-5111-2024****Date of Decision : May 30, 2024****SANDEEP SINGH****-PETITIONER****V/S****STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS****-RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present: Mr. Gursimran Singh Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

*********KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)**

1. Through the instant petition, as filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has sought issuance of directions upon the official respondents to ensure protection of his life and liberty at the hands of private respondents. In addition, the petitioner has sought issuance of directions upon the official respondents to submit a status report regarding the complaints/representations made by him against the private respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, owing to a long prevailing rivalry, the respondent No.9 along with his accomplices assaulted the petitioner on 12.03.2024, whereupon, the petitioner reported the said incident to police by making a representation dated 16.03.2024 against the aggressors, however, his said representation remained inactioned and on the contrary, he was himself nominated as an accused in a false FIR No.22 dated 17.03.2024, registered at P.S. Ranjit Avenue, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar, at the behest of respondent No.9.

3. What further erupts from a naked eye scrutiny of the instant petition, as also the representations enclosed therewith, is that, only bald and vague allegations regarding assault/threats being extended to the petitioner by the pri-



CRWP-5111-2024

2

vate respondents are made therein. No supportive material has been placed on record by the petitioner to corroborate his allegations. Therefore, such bald and vague allegations, which *prima facie* appear to be founded upon baseless pleas and promoted rather by mere assumptions and presumptions, cannot be readily and naively accepted by this Court, in the absence of any valid and convincing material in support thereof.

4. Nonetheless, even if the grievance canvassed by the petitioner in the instant petition is taken to be *bona fide*, yet this Court is not inclined to grant the asked for reliefs, inasmuch as, the petitioner has, instead of recouring the alternative appropriate remedy(ies) for redressal of his grievance, straightway motioned this Court, through the instant petition. The petitioner is well seized of an alternative remedy to approach the Illaqa Magistrate concerned, through recouring the mandate as comprised in Section 156(3) of the Cr.P.C.

5. Therefore, when for the reasons (*supra*), the instant petition is a misconceived motion, consequently, at this stage, this Court refrains from making any observation and as such, no intervention is called for. Accordingly, the instant petition is **dismissed**, however, as prayed for by the learned counsel for the petitioners, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to avail all available alternative statutory remedies before the appropriate forum/authority concerned.

May 30, 2024
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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