

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

**Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:053260
CRWP-8726-2023
Date of Decision: April 20, 2024**

Jai Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Tanveer Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

Request for adjournment has been received from Shri Rahul Bhargava, Advocate for the petitioner. Said request is declined, considering the fact that even on the last date of hearing, the matter had been adjourned on the request of counsel for the petitioner.

2. On 04.09.2023, following order was passed by this Court:-

“The grievance of the petitioner is that despite losing civil litigation up to this High Court, respondent Nos.5 & 6 are now arm twisting the petitioner so as to not to pursue the litigation, by conniving with the police. It is alleged that petitioner and his family members are being threatened by respondent Nos.5 & 6 with the help of respondent No.4 i.e. Station House Officer, Sadar Patiala, District Patiala, Punjab.

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 4 only.

Mr. Parneet Singh Pandher, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 4.

Let reply be filed by way of an affidavit of respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, Punjab in the light of allegations made in the complaint and particularly representation (Annexure P-3).

Adjourned to 15.11.2023.

**Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:053260
CRWP-8726-2023**

- 2 -

In the meantime, threat perception to the petitioner and his family members be assessed. If any threat is found, then necessary protection be provided.”

3. Report dated 11.11.2023 of Shri Varun Sharma, Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, District Patiala on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 4 has been received, as per which the Superintendent of Police, City Patiala conducted thorough inquiry by joining both the parties. He recorded statement of witnesses and statements of the parties and obtained relevant documents and after concluding the thorough inquiry, it was found that the matter was civil in nature. No truth was found in any of the allegations levelled against the MLA, Sangrur regarding breach of peace between the parties and as such no police action was found to be required. The report further states that no threat to the life, liberty or property of the petitioner was found at the hands of the private respondents because petitioner is residing at Tarn Taran, District Amritsar; whereas private respondents are residing at District Patiala.

4. In view of aforesaid report received from the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, no further direction is required to be issued by this Court. This petition is accordingly disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to avail the alternate remedies available to him, in accordance with law.

April 20, 2024
sarita

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

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