



CRWP No.9989 of 2024

108

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No. 9989 of 2024

Date of Decision: 18.10.2024

Gurwinder Singh Dhillon

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. G.B.S. Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Swati Batra, D.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

Apprehending for life and liberty at the hands of the private respondents, the petitioner, invoking the fundamental right of life guaranteed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, has come up before this Court seeking protection through the State.

2. Notices served upon the official respondents through the State's counsel. Given the nature of the order that this Court proposes to pass, neither the response of official respondents nor the issuance of notices to the private respondents is required

3. If the allegations of apprehension of threat to life turn out to be true, it might lead to an irreversible loss. Thus, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it shall be appropriate that the concerned Superintendent of Police, SHO, or any officer to whom such powers have been delegated or have been authorized in this regard, provide appropriate protection to the petitioner for one week from today. However, if the petitioner no longer requires the protection, then at their request, it may be discontinued even before the expiry of two weeks. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities or upon the oral or written request of the petitioner.

4. The protection is subject to the stringent condition that from the time such protection is given, the petitioners shall refrain from attending parties, bars, picnics



CRWP No.9989 of 2024

or any area that may pose a risk to their life. The SHO should send police officer(s) to petitioners' home to assess the required level of security. Once the assessment is done, the officer should provide adequate security without the petitioners having to contact them. This order is further subject to the condition that the petitioner shall keep on blocking the phone numbers from where he received threatening calls.

5. It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits and that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation of the petitioner is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for the petitioner to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

6. **This order shall eclipse after one month from today.**

7. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order, and any Advocate for the Petitioner and State can download this order and other relevant particulars from the official web page of this court and attest it to be a true copy. The concerned officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for immediate use.*

Petition is allowed to the extent mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

18.10.2024
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No.