

2024.PHHC.133237



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

203-1

CWP-4277-2016 (O&M)

JAGJIT SINGH CHAWLA (SINCE DECEASED)
THROUGH LRs.

... Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondents

A N D

203-2

**CRWP-1135-2020
Date of Decision: 30.09.2024**

JASDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHER

... Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate
for the petitioners in both cases.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.K. Khunger, Advocate
for respondents No.7 to 9 in CWP-4277-2016.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

With the consent of counsel for the respective parties both the petitions are being decided by a common order. Facts, for the facility of reference are, however, extracted from CWP-4277-2016 titled Jagjit Singh Chawla versus State of Punjab and others.

Prayer in the said petition is for directing the respondents No.2 to 4 to initiate inquiry and to take action as per law against respondents No. 7 to 9



for taking and demanding bribe from the petitioner by threatening to implicate him and his family members in false criminal case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a crusader against corruption and has prepared a video CD of 14 corrupt police officials of Ludhiana, who are facing trials under Section 7, 11 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 before the Special Court. She submits that all the said accused persons, in collusion with their superiors, had tried their level best to close the evidence of prosecution, without leading any evidence. The petitioner approached this Court by filing CRM-M-15929 of 2014 for seeking issuance of directions from this Court to the trial Court to secure the presence of the witnesses which was allowed vide order dated 05.02.2015. She contends that the witnesses were threatened by the police officials and the petitioner was pressurized to withdraw the case bearing FIR No.168 of 2003 by booking him in DDR No.12 on 12.05.2015 under Section 110 Cr.P.C. It is also alleged that an FIR No.10 dated 14.01.2012 was also registered at Police Station Division No.6, Ludhiana against the son of the petitioner for the offence punishable under Section 15/61/85 of the NDPS Act, 1985 by Sub Inspector Shiv Kumar, who was officiating Station House Officer at that point of time merely because the son of the petitioner lodged an FIR No.134 in the year 2009 in Police Station Division No.6, Ludhiana implicating the police officials. It is pointed out that the son of the petitioner was acquitted in the said case by the Special Court at Ludhiana vide order/judgment dated 07.08.2015 and a finding was given by the Special Court that the son of the petitioner had been falsely implicated due to initiation of proceedings against the police official. A



representation was thereafter submitted by the son of the petitioner to respondent No.2- Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh but as no action has been taken thereupon, he approached this Court again for seeking issuance of directions to respondent No.2 to take action against respondents No.3 to 7 for falsely implicating the son of the petitioner in the abovesaid FIR. The said CRM-M-36644 of 2015 was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 28.10.2015 directing the respondents to take a decision on the representation submitted by the son of the petitioner. It is averred that the abovesaid direction further enraged the police officials even though no further action was taken and rather, the police officials started taking steps to further harass the father of the petitioner under different offences. COCP No.1372 of 2015 was also filed by the petitioner before this Court in which the erring police officials were summoned. The petitioner thereafter approached this Court espousing his grievance that despite submission of complaint against 14 police officials of Ludhiana, no action has been taken and instead pressure is being put upon the petitioner for effecting a compromise, failing which he alongwith his family members shall be implicated in false and frivolous cases. He thus filed another petition, apprehending false implication, bearing No.38193 of 2015 with a prayer that a prior notice under Section 160 of the Cr.P.C. be given to him in case he is required in relation to any criminal proceedings. The said CRM-M-38193 of 2015 was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 06.11.2015 directing the respondents that in the event of any criminal case being filed or registered against the petitioner, wherein his presence would be required, an advance notice of one week under Section 160 Cr.P.C. shall be served upon



him. She further contends that after passing of the said order, the respondents started further harassing the petitioner and started demanding more money on the pretext that a Calendra under Section 110 of Cr.P.C. shall be issued against the petitioner for declaring him as BC (Bad Character), in case the illegal gratification is not given by him. The petitioner thereafter acceded to their demand and paid huge sums of money for saving his skin from the wrath of police. A Compact Disk (CD) was, however, prepared by the petitioner wherein the respondents are seen receiving illegal gratification from them. It is contended that despite the directions issued by this Court in CRM-M-38193 of 2015, the petitioner was arrested without notice and an FIR No.13 dated 31.01.2016 was registered against him under Sections 294-A and 420 of the IPC read with Section 13-A of the Public Gambling Act, 1867 at Police Station Division No.6, Ludhiana. A separate proceeding for the same has been initiated by the petitioner. It is on account of such multifarious litigation between the petitioner and the police officials, he has approached this Court for seeking initiation of inquiry against the police officials and for proper investigation into the matter.

Reply by way of short affidavit of G. Nageswara Rao, IPS, Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh has been filed on behalf of respondent No.3. A status report dated 28.11.2017 has also been placed on record, wherein it has been averred that a number of criminal cases have been registered against the petitioner relating to cheating, gambling, lotteries, robbery, extortion, trespassing, hurting, murder and assault against police officials and in some cases, he has been acquitted while he has been convicted



in some other cases and some of them are still pending. The details of the said cases, as per the abovesaid status report, is given hereinafter below:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Present Status
1.	FIR No.41 dated 12.06.2001 u/s 302/120 IPC PS Dehlon Ludhiana	Acquitted 10.11.2008
2.	FIR No.05 dated 06.01.2017 u/s 12 PC Act PS Division No.7 Ludhiana	Under Investigation
3.	FIR No.43 dated 12.06.2001 u/s 302/120 IPC PS Dehlon Ludhiana	Under Investigation
4.	FIR No.28 dated 05.02.2017 u/s 12 FPC Act 192/193, PS Jamalpur Ludhiana	Under Investigation
5.	FIR No.232 dated 18.06.1989 Under Excise Act PS Division No.6 Ludhiana	Convicted 23.12.1989
6.	FIR No.159 dated 10.07.1996 u/s 324/326/34/120-B IPC, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Acquitted 08.01.1998
7.	FIR No.16 dated 03.02.1998 u/s 153-A/120-B IPC, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Acquitted 06.03.2002
8.	FIR No.21 dated 15.01.1999 u/s 384/506/120B/420 IPC PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Acquitted 30.08.2005
9.	FIR No.132 dated 22.04.1999 u/s 382/454/506/452 IPC PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
10.	FIR No.144/1999 u/s 311/420/506/342/511 IPC PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Acquitted 22.12.2007
11.	FIR No.144 of 2001 dated 22.05.2001 u/s 382/325/506/148/149 IPC PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Convicted 21.09.2009
12.	FIR No.454 dated 05.11.2001 under Gambling Act & IPC PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Acquitted 25.09.2007
13.	FIR No.67 dated 13.02.2003 u/s Gambling Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Fine Rs.500/- on 04.12.2016
14.	FIR No.68 dated 13.02.2003 u/s 353/186 IPC, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial



15.	FIR No.221 dated 06.06.2003 u/s Gambling Act PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Acquitted 21.10.2011
16.	FIR No.12 dated 14.01.2008 u/s 323/341/506/34 IPC, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Acquitted 30.04.2008
17.	FIR No.17 dated 12.11.2008 u/s Gambling Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
18.	FIR No.9 dated 14.01.2012 u/s Gambling Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
19.	FIR No.163 dated 23.11.2013 u/s Gambling Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
20.	FIR No.145 dated 02.11.2014 u/s 382/323/427/34, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
21.	FIR No.118 dated 09.07.1993 u/s Gambling Act, PS Sadar Ludhiana.	Acquitted 10.01.1995
22.	FIR No.158 dated 15.12.2014 u/s Gambling Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Convicted & fined with amount of Rs.500/-
23.	FIR No.168/2003 dated 24.04.2003 u/s PC Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
24.	FIR No.173 dated 02.10.2015 u/s 294-A, 420 IPC 7(3) Lottery Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
25.	FIR No.13 dated 31.01.2016 u/s 294/420/120-B IPC and Lottery Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
26.	FIR No.245 dated 06.03.2003 u/s 452/323/324 SC/ST Act PS Haibowal, Ludhiana	Acquitted 12.03.2008
27.	FIR No.230 dated 05.09.1994 u/s Gambling Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Convicted 16.12.1994
28.	FIR No.31 dated 04.03.2003 u/s 336/427/447/506/511, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial
29.	FIR No.46 dated 29.03.2003 u/s 294-A/420/120-B IPC and Lottery Act, PS Division No.6, Ludhiana.	Under Trial



It was reported that on account of involvement of the petitioner in a large number of cases, the proceedings under Section 110 Cr.P.C. had been initiated and the petitioner had been released on a probation bond with a condition to maintain peace and not to commit further offence for a period of one year i.e. from 30.11.2015 to 30.11.2016. Response about registration of FIR No.10 dated 14.01.2012 under Section 15 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Division No.6 has also been given in the abovesaid report and submitted that the acquittal of the petitioner's son was on account of the fact that the prosecution was not able to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt against him. Hence, a benefit of doubt was extended to him but it was not held to be a false case having been foisted upon the son of the petitioner.

Details of various other FIRs, that had been registered against the petitioner, had also been given in the aforesaid report submitted by the Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh and it was pointed out that insofar as the issue of demand and acceptance of bribe money by the police officials is concerned, a notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C. was sent to the petitioner requiring him to appear in the office of the Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh along with the audio/video recordings or any other evidence qua acceptance of bribe money. A request was received by the Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh from the petitioner that he was suffering from liver problem for the last one year and is under treatment for the same. It was informed by him that the documents can be collected from Shri Amandeep Singh, Advocate having mobile No.99149-28302. The said advocate was also contacted by the DSP, Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana, whereupon he replied that



he is not in possession of such documents/evidence and that he can provide the copy of the said CD only after obtaining the same from the Court. Hence, the CD, on which reliance has been placed by the petitioner, has never been made available to the Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh. It was submitted that in the event of the CD having been provided, two months' more time may be granted so as to verify the same and for submission of complete and final status report.

A short reply by way of affidavit of Jaswinder Singh, PPS, DSP, Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana Range dated 22.01.2018 was also filed in compliance with the order dated 29.11.2017, whereby the petitioner had been directed by this Court to appear before the officer to be nominated by the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana on 05.12.2017 at 11.00 a.m. sharp and supply all information/compact disc in support of allegations levelled in the petition and further proceedings were ordered to be apprised. It has been specifically averred in the abovesaid affidavit that the petitioner did not appear before the SIT on 05.12.2017 to hand over the CD but sent a CD by post which was received in the Litigation Branch, CPO, Ludhiana on 06.12.2017. When an attempt was made to examine the said CD, the data regarding the allegations levelled in the petition was not completely audible and visible. A request was again sent to the petitioner to appear in person and supply the original CD but it was reported that the petitioner had expired by that time and the attested copy of the death certificate of the petitioner was also attached alongwith the abovesaid affidavit.



A reply dated 10.02.2020 on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 has also been filed by way of an affidavit of Waryam Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Central Ludhiana, wherein the abovementioned details were specifically mentioned and it was pointed out that the petitioner did not submit the evidence pertaining to the original CD or the source thereof with the Investigating Agency despite having been notified about the same and notwithstanding the directions issued by this Court. Hence, the allegations levelled in the present petition could not be verified.

A separate short reply way of affidavit of ASI Sohan Lal, Police Station Division No.6, Ludhiana has also been filed on behalf of respondent No.7 to 9, wherein it has been averred that as many as 25 FIRs had been registered against the petitioner. Further, the details have also been given with respect to the 17 FIRs that had been registered against the petitioner and he was already convicted in four FIRs while nearly 13 FIRs were pending against him.

Despite the matter being pending before this Court since 2016 and the abovesaid affidavits and replies having been filed by the official respondents long ago, no replication/rejoinder controverting the same has been filed by the petitioner. There is no response also to the specific affidavit filed by the respondent authorities that the petitioner did not turn up to hand over the original CD for verification of the allegations levelled in the present petition notwithstanding the orders passed by this Court. Even the said aspect remain undisputed and undenied. The only response was that Jagjit Singh Chawla has passed away. There is no such other satisfactory explanation giving the reasons for non-submission of the requisite proof which he claimed to have been

**CWP-4277-2016 & CRWP-1135-2020****-10-**

appended alongwith the present petition, so as to verify the claim made by the petitioner about any demand being allegedly made from him.

Under the given circumstances, I am of the opinion that in view of the undisputed and undenied position of fact as depicted by the respondents and the matter having already been examined by the office of Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh and the persistent failure of the petitioner to provide the necessary documents/proofs, no further directions can be issued in the present petition.

The present petition is accordingly dismissed.

The petitioner may, if so advised, take recourse to the alternative remedies for seeking redressal of his grievances.

CRWP-1135-2020

The present petition has been filed by the petitioners for seeking directions to the respondent to protect the life and liberty and also to provide adequate security to the petitioners as they are the whistle blowers against the police officials.

The instant petition is in continuation of the proceedings that had been instituted by the father of the petitioners against the police officials. It is on account of the said history of litigation *inter se* between the petitioners and the police officials that the present petition has been filed by the petitioners for seeking protection to their lives and liberties.

Reply way of affidavit of Vaibhav Sehgal, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana has been filed on behalf of the respondents, wherein it was averred as under:



“1. That the entire petition is engulfed with wrong version of facts. On 25.08.2019, ASI Dhanwant Singh alongwith other police employees was present Near Akai Hospital, Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana in connection with patrolling duty when he received a secret information, that petitioner no.2 and his three accomplices are gambling with Playing Cards at Fitness Villa, Kirti Nagar, Ludhiana and if raid is conducted, then petitioner no.2 and his three other accomplices can be apprehended while gambling. Accordingly FIR No.223 dated 25.08.2019, u/s 13/3/67 of Punjab Gambling Act, P.S. Moti Nagar, Ludhiana was registered against petitioner no.2 and his three accomplices. Thereafter raid was conducted in a house situated opposite to Tikoni Park, Kirti Nagar, Ludhiana. During the raid, petitioner no.2 and his three accomplices namely Gaurav, Jasvir Singh and Harpreet Singh were apprehended while gambling. 52 Playing Cards and cash of Rs.59,000/- was also recovered from petitioner no.2 and his co-accused. During the investigation, It transpired that the said house was in the name of the deceased father of petitioner no.2 and now the said house was being used for the purpose of gambling only. therefore offences u/s 3, 4 of the Gambling Act was also added on 25.08.2019. After completion of the Investigation, Challan/Final Report u/s 173 Cr.P.C. has also been presented against petitioner no.2 and his co-accused before the Ld. Trial Court on 23.10.2019 and now they are facing the trial. Hence, the present petition is liable to be dismissed on this ground alone.

2. That, however, on 12.07.2018, one Deepak Kumar alias Jhurli had made a statement with the police levelling allegations that on 12.07.2018 at 06.30 PM, the said complainant alongwith the present petitioners were playing cricket at Palm City Colony, Kohara and in the meantime, two youngsters of 20/22 years of age came on a motorcycle and one of them fired a gunshot at the said



complainant which crossed near his ear and they ran from the spot. When the complainant followed the said person, then they also fired another shot which was missed. Accordingly FIR No.166 dated 17.07.2018, u/s 307, 511, 506 IPC and 25/54/59 of Arms Act, P.S. Jamalpur, Ludhiana was registered against unknown persons. Further investigation is being conducted.

However, petitioner no.1 further made a statement with the police that on 17.07.2018 he had received a threatening phone call from one Mobile No.98554-22659 and the person calling from the other side proclaimed himself to be the person who had fired at the said complainant and threatened petitioner no.1 that his brother petitioner no.2 has been saved as the complainant came in front and if petitioner no.1 wants his brother i.e. petitioner no.2, then petitioner no.1 has to pay for the life of petitioner no.2. That unknown person further threatened that next time bullet will be fired at the forehead of your brother. Accordingly the call details of the said phone number 98554-22659 was obtained which was of one person namely Lovepreet Singh, R/o Amritsar. Accordingly the said Lovepreet Singh was joined in the investigation during which he stated that some unknown persons had snatched his mobile phone and the said threatening call had been made to petitioner no.1. Apart from it, various other suspected persons were also joined in the investigation but their involvement was not found in the crime. However, efforts are being made to find out the persons who had attacked at the said complainant and made the threatening call.

However, as the present petitioners are residing within the jurisdiction of P.S. Division No.7, Ludhiana, therefore the then ACP has written a Letter No.974-976-5A/ACP dated 21.07.2018 to the ACP (East), Ludhiana to ensure the protection of the petitioners. Accordingly the ACP (East), Ludhiana has issued a



Letter No.632-5A/ACP. East dated 24.07.2018 to the SHO, P.S. Division No.7, Ludhiana and further SHO, P.S. Division No.7, Ludhiana vide his Letter No.200/5A dated 21.08.2018 has directed the motorcycle employees of the Police Control Room of the residential area of the petitioners to take a regular round to the house of the petitioners. Apart from it, the patrolling parties of Police Station Division No.7, Ludhiana have also been directed to keep a special vigil at the residence of the petitioners. Phone numbers of the concerned SHO, ACP as well as that of the Police Control Room have been given to the petitioners and they have been asked that in any untoward incident, the petitioners can make a call and the police will be there within no time.”

Vide order dated 14.02.2023, this Court had directed the State to submit a report about the threat perception to the petitioner after getting the same assessed from the Competent Authority. In compliance thereto, a status report by way of affidavit of Murad Jasvir Singh Gill, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Industrial Area-A, on behalf of the respondents had been filed. The relevant extract thereof reads thus:

“3. That the SHO, P.S. Moti Nagar, Ludhiana was directed to comply with the above noted order of this Hon'ble Court and thereafter the SHO has reported that ASI Malkit Singh of P.S. Moti Nagar, Ludhiana was deputed to assess the threat perception to the petitioners. Accordingly the said ASI went to the house of the petitioners but the petitioners were not there and their mother was in the house who told that the petitioners are not at home and when the said ASI asked the petitioners' mother to give their mobile phone numbers, then she refused to do so. She further refused to give any more information about the petitioners. However, from the query from the nearby people, it was found that



the petitioners have absolutely no threat from anybody. However, the said ASI has provided his mobile phone number as well as mobile phone number of the SHO and MHC of P.S. Moti Nagar and also the mobile phone number of the PCR employees of the area and advised the petitioners' mother to call in need and within no time, the police will be there. The PCR employees of the area have also been directed by the SHO to take regular round to the house of the petitioners.

4. *That the facts of the case are that one Deepak Kumar alias Jhurli had made a statement with the police levelling allegations that on 12.07.2018 at 06.30 PM, the said complainant alongwith the present petitioners were playing cricket at Palm City Colony, Kohara and in the meantime, two youngsters of 20/22 years of age came on a motorcycle and one of them fired a gunshot at the said complainant which crossed near his ear and they ran from the spot. When the complainant followed the said person, then they also fired another shot which was missed. Accordingly FIR No.166 dated 17.07.2018, u/s 307, 511, 506 IPC and 25/54/59 of Arms Act, P.S. Jamalpur, Ludhiana was registered against unknown persons.*

However, petitioner no.1 further made a statement with the police that on 17.07.2018 he had received a threatening phone call from one Mobile No.98554-22659 and the person calling from the other side proclaimed himself to be the person who had fired at the said complainant and threatened petitioner no.1 that his brother petitioner no.2 has been saved as the complainant came in front and if petitioner no.1 wants his brother i.e. petitioner no.2, then petitioner no.1 has to pay for the life of petitioner no.2. That unknown person further threatened that next time bullet will be fired at the forehead of your brother. Accordingly the call details of the said phone number 98554-22659 was obtained which was of



one person namely Lovepreet Singh, R/o Amritsar. Accordingly the said Lovepreet Singh was joined in the investigation during which he stated that some unknown persons had snatched his mobile phone and the said threatening call had been made to petitioner no.1. Apart from it, various other suspected persons Were also joined in the investigation but their involvement was not found in the crime. Ultimately Untrace Report u/s 173 Cr.P.C. was prepared in the said FIR and the same has also been accepted on 09.02.2022 by the Court of Sh. Karan Aggarwal, Ld. JMIC, Ludhiana. However, there is absolutely no threat to the petitioners from anybody.”

The matter came up for hearing again on 27.03.2023, when this Court directed the status report to be filed by a senior police officer after getting the threat perception of the petitioners evaluated by the Security Committee, headed by ADGP, Security, Punjab. Accordingly, status report by way of affidavit of Satinderpal Singh, PPS, Assistant Inspector General of Police, Security, Punjab, Chandigarh has been filed. The relevant extract thereof reads thus:

“3. That in compliance and pursuance of the orders of this Hon'ble High Court, a fresh assessment of threat perception in respect of petitioner has been carried out by the office of Additional Director General of Police, Security, Punjab, as per the guidelines prescribed in the State Security Policy-2013 in accordance thereof, fresh threat perception reports have been obtained from the concerned quarters.

4. That the respondents are guided by the norms and guidelines laid down in the afore mentioned State Security Policy 2013. According to the State Security Policy 2013, personal



security cover to private individuals is provided on the basis of an evaluation of threat perception, which is subject to periodic reviews. The perception of threat is evaluated on the basis of an elaborate threat assessment exercise, and it is only after a careful consideration and an objective assessment and analysis of latest inputs received from the State Intelligence / field units that the security cover is deployed withdrawn / or modified accordingly. The office of Addl, DGP, Security, Punjab, is the competent authority for carrying out assessment of threat and for the deployment/ withdrawal / review of security cover.

5. *That it is humbly submitted that the norms and guidelines for providing security to individual protectees have been laid down in the State Security Policy 2013, which was notified by the Punjab Government on 02.09.2013, in pursuance of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No. 25237 of 2010 in case titled Abhay Singh vis State of UP and others. The State Security Policy-2013 stipulates that "Police officers are recruited, trained and maintained at a huge cost borne by the taxpayer, and are, therefore, meant to be deployed for the protection of the community. Providing police officers to individuals for their protection at the cost of the taxpayer is not the function of the State or the government and that "personal protection at State expense was always meant to be an exception, and not the rule. Further according to the "Yellow Book" issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi laid down guidelines for making security arrangements for protection of individuals "The tendency to continue with security arrangements even in the absence of real threat should be avoided*

6. *That the threat reports have been examined by this office which were obtained from the concerned quarters i.e. the State Intelligence Punjab and the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana*



The State Intelligence, Punjab has stated the petitioners father had a Lottery Business in Ludhiana, who had got registered a corruption case FIR No 168, dated 25.04.2003, PS Division No. 06, Ludhiana against 15 Police officials, which is under trial in Ludhiana Court. Their father had died in year 2017. According to the field unit report and office record, at present there is no specific threat input indicating any threat to their security from any terrorist/militant/gangster outfits operating in the country. The Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana has stated in it's report that they have filed above said writ petition in the Hon'ble High Court, regarding grant of security for their life and property. In their petition they have mentioned an incident that they were shot at by some unknown assailant, due to that a FIR No. 166, dated 17.07.2018 u/s 307, 511, 506 IPC and 25-54-59 Arms Act was registered at PS Jamalpur They have also received some threat calls on Jasdeep Singh's mobile phone But in their written statement they requested that, at present we are living well and we are not getting any threat from anyone as such, we do not need any police protection and we do not want police protection anymore After examining all the facts there is no threat to their life and liberty and also they are not willing to take any police protection

7. That in view of the above mentioned facts and circumstances, it is submitted that the provision of personal security cover to the petitioner at state expense is not warranted in the instant case, as per the guidelines laid down in the State Security Policy-2013. However, directions is being issued to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana to adequately sensitize the local police to take suitable, need based preventive measures so as to avoid any untoward incident”



It has been averred that the allegations of the petitioners have been evaluated thrice over by officials and they have submitted a report that there is no valid apprehension and that the petitioners do not need any police protection. The abovesaid status report was filed by the respondents on 17.05.2023, however, despite lapse of more than a year, no replication/rejoinder or counter affidavit has been filed by the petitioners. The apprehension of the petitioners has already been examined by different authorities at multiple levels but they did not find any threat apprehension against the lives and liberties of the petitioners.

The averments raised by the respondents have remained uncontroverted and unrebutted, hence, no further directions are required to be issued.

The present petition is accordingly dismissed.

Misc. application(s) in both the cases, if any, also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

30.09.2024
rajender

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*