

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

CRM-M-29371-2019
Date of Decision : 20.05.2024

SUKHDEV SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, prayer is for issuance of a *mandamus* upon the official respondents no.2, to protect the life and liberty of the present petitioner at the hands of private respondents no.6 and 7, and for further directing especially respondents no.3 to 5 not to unnecessarily harass the petitioner, and further to comply with the mandatory provisions of Section 160 Cr.P.C. in case he is required for any investigation or inquiry.

2. Upon notice of motion issued vide order dated 12.07.2019, separate replies dated 25.07.2019, were filed on behalf of respondents no.3 to 5, as depicts from the order dated 05.08.2019.

3. A perusal of the aforesaid replies, it reflects that an FIR has been registered against the present petitioner, and he was required to join the investigation in the said FIR.

4. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 24.04.2024, following order was passed by this Court:-

“No one has caused appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

Purely in the interest of justice, last opportunity is granted to learned counsel for the petitioner to address arguments.

Adjourned to 20.05.2024.

It is made clear that on the next date of hearing, in case no one appears on behalf of the petitioner, this Court would decide the matter on its own merits.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

5. Today also, no one has caused appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

6. What reflects from the perusal of the entire petition, is that the petitioner in fact concealed the *factum* of registration of the FIR against him, and not only that, under the garb of instant petition, his only endeavour is to scuttle the ongoing investigation.

7. Since no one has caused appearance on behalf of the petitioner today as well, it clearly reflects that the apprehension as shown by present petitioner, regarding the threat to his life and liberty, is in fact a false apprehension.

8. Therefore, there is no merit in the instant petition, which is consequently, **dismissed**.

May 20, 2024
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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