



CRWP-7927-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(238)

CRWP-7927-2024
Date of Decision : 18.11.2024

Jatinder Singh ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Petitioner-Jatinder Singh in person with
Mr. Aman Raj Bajwa, Advocate.

Mr. Raghav Garg, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Mr. Aman Raj Bajwa, Advocate has caused appearance on behalf of the learned senior arguing counsel and submits that they do not have further instructions from the petitioner to address the arguments.
2. Mr. Jatinder Singh, petitioner has caused appearance in person.
3. Through the instant petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a mandamus upon the official respondents concerned, to provide adequate security to the petitioner through C.R.P.F., as the security earlier provided to him, was withdrawn by the respondents No.1 to 3, without assigning any reason or prior notice.
4. This Court, vide order dated 20.08.2024, had directed the learned State counsel to file a reply, on affidavit of a responsible functionary, detailing therein, whether the threat perception, as alleged by the petitioner, genuinely exists or the same is based upon mere assumptions and presumptions.
5. In deference to the directions issued by this Court, vide order dated 20.08.2024, short reply dated 17.11.2024, by way of affidavit of

Commissionerate Ludhiana, on behalf of the respondent-State of Punjab, furnished by the learned State counsel today in the Court. The same is taken on the record. Copy thereof, supplied to the petitioner.

6. The study survey of the reply (supra), makes revelation that the deponent sought a detailed report from the SHO concerned, with regard to threat perception to the petitioner. The report was filed by the SHO concerned, and the same was perused by the ADCP-II, Ludhiana, who after concurring with the findings in the report, forwarded the same to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana. As per the report, there is no threat perception exists, as on today, as alleged by the present petitioner, and finally, the file was ordered to be consigned to the record.

7. This Court has heard the petitioner in person, at length, and he is unable to substantiate the claim, as made in the instant petition, except the various complaints made by him, to the different authorities, including the pendency of the civil suit, between the present petitioner and private individual persons.

8. In view of the specific affidavit (supra), this Court does not find any merit in the instant petition. Therefore, the same is hereby, **dismissed**. However, in case, in future, the petitioner has any threat perception to his life and liberty, he may approach to the respondent No.2, who shall after examining the threat perception, would take adequate measures/pass appropriate orders.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

November 18, 2024
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No